arXiv:1404.4605v2 [math.ST] 5 Jun 2015

Quantile Spectral Analysis for Locally Stationary Time Series

Stefan Birr[a*], Stanislav Volgushev[a*], Tobias Kley[a*], Holger Dette[a*], and Marc Hallin[b†]

[a]Ruhr-Universität Bochum

[b]ECARES, Université Libre de Bruxelles and ORFE, Princeton University

June 8, 2015

Abstract

Classical spectral methods are subject to two fundamental limitations: they only can account for covariance-related serial dependencies, and they require second-order stationarity. Much attention has been devoted recently to quantile-based spectral methods that go beyond covariance-based serial dependence features. At the same time, covariance-based methods relaxing stationarity into much weaker *local stationarity* conditions have been developed for a variety of time-series models. Here, we are combining those two approaches by proposing quantile-based spectral methods for locally stationary processes. We therefore introduce a time-varying version of the copula spectra that have been recently proposed in the literature, along with a suitable local lag-window estimator. We propose a new definition of *strict* local stationarity that allows us to handle completely general non-linear processes without any moment assumptions, thus accommodating our quantile-based concepts and methods. We establish a central limit theorem for our estimator, and illustrate the power of the new methodology by means of simulations and an empirical study of the Standard & Poor's

*Supported by the Sonderforschungsbereich "Statistical modelling of nonlinear dynamic processes" (SFB 823, Teilprojekt A1, C1) of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

†Académie Royale de Belgique, CentER (Tilburg University), and ECORE. Supported by the IAP research network grant P7/06 of the Belgian government (Belgian Science Policy) and a Crédit aux Chercheurs of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS.

500 series. This empirical study brings evidence of important variations in serial dependence structures both across time (crises and quiet periods exhibit quite different dependence structures) and across quantiles (dependencies between extreme quantiles are not the same as in the 'median' range of the series). Such variations remain completely undetected, and are actually undetectable, via classical covariance-based spectral methods.

AMS 1980 subject classification : 62M15, 62G35.
Key words and phrases : Nonstationarity, Copulas, Ranks.

1 Introduction

For more than a century, spectral methods have been among the favorite tools of time-series analysis. The concept of *periodogram* was proposed and discussed as early as 1898 by Schuster, who coined the term in a study (Schuster (1898)) of meteorological series. The modern mathematical foundations of the approach were laid between 1930 and 1950 by such big names as Wiener, Cramér, Kolmogorov, Bartlett, and Tukey. The main reason for the unwavering success of spectral methods is that they are entirely *model-free*, hence fully nonparametric; as such, they can be considered a precursor to the subsequent development of nonparametric techniques in the area and, despite their age, they still are part of the leading group of methods in the field.

The classical spectral approach to time series analysis, however, remains deeply marked by two major restrictions:

(i) as a second-order theory, it is essentially limited to modeling first- and second-order dynamics: being entirely covariance-based, it cannot accommodate heavy tails and infinite variances, and cannot account for any dynamics in conditional skewness, kurtosis, or tail behavior;

(ii) the assumption of second-order stationarity is pervasive: except for processes that, possibly after some adequate transformation such as differencing or cointegration, are

second-order stationary, observations exhibiting time-varying distributional features are ruled out.

The first of these two limitations recently has attracted much attention, and new quantile-related spectral analysis tools have been proposed, which do not require second-order moments, and are able to capture serial features that cannot be accounted for by the classical second-order approach. Pioneering contributions in that direction are Hong (1999) and Li (2008), who coined the names of *Laplace spectrum* and *Laplace periodogram*. The Laplace spectrum concept was further studied by Hagemann (2011), and extended into *cross-spectrum* and spectral *kernel* concepts by Dette et al. (2015), who also introduced *copula-based* versions of the same. Those cross-spectral quantities are indexed by couples (τ_1, τ_2) of quantile levels, and their collections (for $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in [0,1]^2$) account for any features of the joint distributions of pairs (X_t, X_{t-k}) in a strictly stationary process $\{X_t\}$, without requiring any distributional assumptions such as the existence of finite moments.

That thread of literature also includes Li (2012, 2014), Kley et al. (2014), and Lee and Subba Rao (2012). Somewhat different approaches were taken by Hong (2000), Davis et al. (2013), and several others; in the time domain, Linton and Whang (2007), Davis and Mikosch (2009), and Han et al. (2014) introduced the related concepts of *quantilograms* and *extremograms*. Strict (second-order) stationarity, however, is essential in all those contributions.

The pictures in Figure 1 show that the copula-based spectral methods developed in Dette et al. (2015) (where we refer to for details) indeed successfully account for serial features that remain out of reach in the traditional approach. The series considered in Figure 1 is the classical S&P500 index series, with $T = 12092$ observations from 1962 through 2013; more precisely, that series contains the differences of logarithms of daily opening and closing prices for about 51 years. That series is generally accepted to be white noise, yielding perfectly flat periodograms. When rank-based copula periodograms are substituted for the classical



Figure 1: S&P500, 1962-2013: the smoothed rank-based copula periodograms for $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$, 0.5 and 0.9, respectively. All curves are plotted against $\omega/2\pi$.

ones, however, the picture looks quite different. Three rank-based copula periodograms are shown in Figure 1, for the quantile levels 0.1, 0.5 and 0.9, respectively. The central one, corresponding to the central part of the marginal distribution, is compatible with the assumption of white noise. But the more extreme ones (associated with the quantile levels 0.1 and 0.9) yield a peak at the origin, pointing at a strong dependence in the tails which is definitely not present in the median part of the (marginal) distribution.

Now, all periodograms in Figure 1 were computed from the complete series (51 years, $1 \leq t \leq 12092$), under the presumption of stationarity (more precisely, stationarity in distribution, for all k, of the couples (X_t, X_{t-k})). Is that assumption likely to hold true? Traditional periodograms computed from the four disjoint subseries corresponding to the periods 1962-1974, 1974-1987, 1987-2000, and 2000-2013 are shown in Figure 2, and suggest an evolution in time, by which the descending spectral density of the 1962-1974 period evolves into the ascending one of the more recent 2000-2013 years.

This type of finding raises questions about the second limitation of traditional spectral methods, (second-order) stationarity. It has motivated the development of a rich strand of literature, mainly along four (largely overlapping) lines:

(a) *models with time-dependent parameters*: inherently parametric, those models are mim-

icking the traditional ones, but with parameters varying over time—see, for instance, Subba Rao (1970) for a prototypical contribution, Azrak and Mélard (2006) for an in-depth study of the time-varying ARMA case;

(b) the *evolutionary spectral methods*, initiated by Priestley (1965), where the process under study admits a spectral representation with *time-varying transfer function*—a second-order characterization, thus, but wavelet-based versions also have been considered, as in Nason et al. (2000);

(c) *piecewise stationary processes*, in relation with change-point analysis: see, e.g., Davis et al. (2005);

(d) the *locally stationary process* approach initiated by Dahlhaus (1997), based on the assumption that, over a short period of time (that is, locally in time), the process under study behaves approximately as a stationary one; related concepts have been developed recently by Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006), Zhou and Wu (2009a, b), and Vogt (2012).

We refer to Dahlhaus (2012) for a survey of this approach.

Those four approaches, as already mentioned, are not without overlaps: the original concept by Dahlhaus (1997) is based on time-varying (second-order) spectral representations, turned into time-domain linear MA(∞) ones by Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006). Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006) and Fryzlewicz et al. (2008) deal with locally stationary ARCH models, hence also resort to (a). Most references require moment assumptions, either by nature (being based on a spectral representation), or by the nature of the stationary approximation they are considering.

In this paper, we are trying to address the two limitations (i) and (ii) of traditional spectral analysis simultaneously by developing a local stationary version of the quantile-related spectral analysis proposed in Dette et al. (2015). While adopting the local stationary



Figure 2: S&P500, 1962-2014: the traditional smoothed periodograms for the periods 1962-1974, 1974-1987, 1987-2000, and 2000-2014, respectively. All curves are plotted against $\omega/2\pi$.

ideas of (d), however, we turn them into a fully non-parametric and moment-free approach, adapted to the nature of quantile- and copula-based spectral concepts (see Harvey (2010) for a related, time-domain, attempt). The definitions of local stationarity existing in the literature indeed are not general enough to accommodate quantile spectra, and we therefore formulate a new concept of *local strict stationarity*. Contrary to Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006), which deals with time-varying moving averages, to Dahlhaus (1997), which is based on time-varying second-order spectra, or to Vogt (2012) where the approximation is in terms of stochastic variables and requires finite moments of order $\rho > 0$, our approximation is directly based on joint distribution functions and does not involve any moments. This very general concept of local stationarity allows us to handle completely general non-linear processes without imposing any moment assumptions, to extend to the quantile context the definitions of a local spectrum, and to establish a central limit theorem for our local lag-window estimators.



Figure 3: Time-frequency heatmaps of the quantile lag-window estimator for the log-returns from the S&P500 between 1962-2013 for quantile levels $0.1, 0.5$ and 0.9. The vertical axis represents frequencies ($0 < \omega/2\pi < 0.5$) and the horizontal axis is time ($1 \leq t \leq 12992$). The plots are organized as explained in Section 4.1; the color code is provided along the right-hand side of each figure.

When applied to the S&P500 series of Figures 1 and 2, our local lag-window estimators yield the estimated copula-based spectra shown in the heatmaps of Figure 3 (to be compared with those in Figure 2). Time-varying values, in those heatmaps, are represented by means of a color code, ranging from cyan and light blue ('small values') to orange and red ('large values'), in such a way that dark blue corresponds to regions where the estimated spectrum does not significantly differ from that of a white noise process; see Section 4.1 for details. Whereas the central heatmaps ($\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.5$) are pretty flat (dark blue) with the exception of some deviations from white noise behavior limited to the early seventies, the more extreme

ones ($\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$ and 0.9) suggest an alternance of high low-frequency spectral densities (yellow and red) and perfectly 'flat' (dark blue) periods. A closer analysis of this S&P500 series is provided in Section 4.3, and reveals that those periods of strong dependence in the tails correspond to well-identified crises and booms. Another interesting observation is the asymmetry between the time-varying spectra associated with the left ($\tau = 0.1$) and right ($\tau = 0.9$) tails, which can be interpreted in terms of prospect theory (see Kahneman and Tversky (1979)). That asymmetry is amply confirmed by comparing the estimated spectra associated with $\tau = 0.2$ and $\tau = 0.8$ shown in Figure 4. Inspection of local stationary copula-based spectra thus suggests that the S&P500 series, perhaps, is not as close to white noise as claimed. However, it takes a combination of quantile-related and local stationarity tools to bring some evidence for that fact.

The time-varying copula spectrum and its estimators are introduced in Section 2 and Section 3, respectively. In Section 4, we illustrate the application of the new methodology by means of a small simulation study and a real-life example, while the theoretical properties of time-varying copula spectra and a corresponding lag-window estimator are investigated in Section 5. In particular, a central limit theorem for our local lag-window estimator is established. Details of the proofs and additional information concerning the dataset analyzed in Section 4.3 are deferred to an online supplement.

2 Strict local stationarity and local copula spectra

2.1 Strictly locally stationary processes

Consider an observed series $(X_1, \ldots, X_T)$ of length T as being part of a triangular array $(X_{t,T},\ 1 \leq t \leq T)$, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, of finite-length realizations of nonstationary processes $\{X_{t,T},\ t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $T \in \mathbb{N}$. The intuitive idea behind the definitions of local stationarity by



Figure 4: Time-frequency heatmaps of the quantile lag-window estimators for $\tau_1 = \tau_2 \in \{0.2, 0.8\}$ (no imaginary parts, thus). The vertical axis represents the frequencies ($0 < \omega/2\pi < 0.5$) and the horizontal axis is time ($1 \leq t \leq 12992$); for each value of t, a periodogram is plotted against frequencies via the color code provided along the right-hand side of each figure.

Dahlhaus (1997), Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006), Zhou and Wu (2009a) and Vogt (2012) (to quote only a few) consists in assuming that those processes have an approximately stationary behavior over a short period of time. More formally, all those authors assume the existence of a collection, indexed by $\vartheta \in (0,1)$, of stationary processes $\{X_t^\vartheta,\ t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ such that the nonstationary process $\{X_{t,T},\ t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ can be approximated (in a suitable way), in the vicinity of time t, by the stationary process $\{X_t^\vartheta,\ t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ associated with $\vartheta = t/T$.

The exact nature of this approximation has to be adapted to the specific problem under study. If the objective is a locally stationary extension of classical spectral analysis, only the autocovariances $\mathrm{Cov}(X_{t,T}, X_{s,T})$ have to be approximated. In the quantile-related context considered here, the joint distributions of $X_{t,T}$ and $X_{s,T}$ are the feature of interest, and traditional autocovariances are to be replaced with autocovariances of indicators, of the form $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq q_{t,T}(\tau_1)\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{s,T} \leq q_{s,T}(\tau_2)\}})$, where $q_{t,T}(\tau_1)$ and $q_{s,T}(\tau_2)$ stand for the τ_1-quantile of $X_{t,T}$ and the τ_2-quantile of $X_{s,T}$, respectively, with $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1)$; see Li (2008, 2012), Hagemann (2011), or Dette et al. (2015). Such covariances only depend on the bivariate copulas of $X_{t,T}$ and $X_{s,T}$.

In a strictly stationary context, this leads to the so-called *Laplace spectrum*, first consid-

ered by Li (2008) for a strictly stationary process $\{Y_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with marginal median zero. That spectrum is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_{0.5,0.5}(\omega) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-i\omega k} \mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{I}_{\{Y_0 \leq 0\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{Y_{-k} \leq 0\}}), \qquad \omega \in (-\pi, \pi].$$

Li's concept was extended by Hagemann (2011), Dette et al. (2015), and Li (2012) to general quantile levels. The most general version, which also takes into account *cross*-covariances of indicators, was introduced by Dette et al. (2015). Denoting by q the marginal quantile function of Y_t, they define the *copula spectral density kernel* as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tau_1,\tau_2}(\omega) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-i\omega k} \mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{I}_{\{Y_0 \leq q(\tau_1)\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{Y_{-k} \leq q(\tau_2)\}}), \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1),\ \omega \in (-\pi, \pi].$$

Those definitions all heavily rely on the strict stationarity of the underlying time series; without strict stationarity, actually, they do not make much sense. It seems natural, thus, to look for some adequate notion of local stationarity that can be employed to characterize the notion of a local copula-based spectrum. However, the definitions of local stationarity previously considered in the literature are placing unnecessarily strong restrictions on the classes of processes that can be considered. In particular, Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006), Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006) and Vogt (2012) rely on moment assumptions that are not natural in a quantile context, and are not required for the definition of copula spectra. We therefore introduce a new concept of *strict local stationarity* which completely avoids moment assumptions while allowing us to define and estimate local versions of the copula spectral density kernel. Our concept is not totally unrelated to the existing ones, though, and we also show that, under adequate conditions, processes that fit into the framework of Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006) or Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006) are strictly locally stationary in the new sense; see Section 5.1 for details.

The copula spectral density kernels of a stationary process $\{Y_t\}$ are defined in terms of its bivariate marginal distribution functions. Therefore, it is natural to use bivariate marginal distribution functions when evaluating, in the definition of local stationarity, the distance between the non-stationary process $\{X_{t,T}\}$ under study and its stationary approximation $\{X_t^\vartheta\}$.

Definition 2.1. *A triangular array $\{(X_{t,T})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\}_{T\in\mathbb{N}}$ of processes is called* locally strictly stationary (of order two) *if there exists a constant $L > 0$ and, for every $\vartheta \in (0,1)$, a strictly stationary process $\{X_t^\vartheta, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ such that, for every $1 \le r, s \le T$,*

$$\big\|F_{r,s;T}(\cdot,\cdot) - G^\vartheta_{r-s}(\cdot,\cdot)\big\|_\infty \le L\Big(\max(|r/T-\vartheta|, |s/T-\vartheta|) + 1/T\Big), \tag{2.1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ stands for the supremum norm, while $F_{r,s;T}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $G^\vartheta_k(\cdot,\cdot)$ denote the joint distribution functions of $(X_{r,T}, X_{s,T})$ and $(X_0^\vartheta, X_{-k}^\vartheta)$, respectively.

Here, 'of order two' refers to the fact that (2.1) is based on bivariate distributions only. Letting y tend to infinity in $F_{r,s;T}(x,y)$ and $G^\vartheta_k(x,y)$, we get an analogous condition for the marginal distributions $F_{t;T}$ and G^ϑ of $X_{t,T}$ and X_0^ϑ, namely

$$\big\|F_{t;T}(\cdot) - G^\vartheta(\cdot)\big\|_\infty \le L\big|t/T - \vartheta\big| + L/T. \tag{2.2}$$

Intuitively, (2.1) and (2.2) imply that the univariate and bivariate distribution functions $F_{t;T}$ and $F_{r,s;T}$ of the process $\{X_{t,T}\}$ are allowed to change smoothly over time. One advantage of this definition is its nonparametric nature, as it does not depend on any specific data-generating mechanism. A more detailed comparison of Definition 2.1 with other notions of local stationarity is provided in Section 5.1.

In settings where the data-generating process can be described by a parametric model, strict stationary in the sense of Definition 2.1 holds if the underlying parameters change

smoothly over time. Practically relevant examples of such parametric models include MA(∞), ARCH(∞) and GARCH(p, q) models with time-varying coefficients. Sufficient conditions for strict local stationarity of those models are discussed in Section 5.2, where we also provide explicit forms of the strictly stationary approximating processes.

2.2 Local copula spectral density kernels

Turning to the definition of a localized version of copula spectral density kernels, first consider the copula cross-covariance kernels associated with the strictly stationary process $\{X_t^\vartheta, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\vartheta \in (0,1)$. The *lag-h-copula cross-covariance kernel* of $\{X_t^\vartheta\}$, as defined in Dette et al. (2015), is

$$\gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2) := \mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^\vartheta \le q^\vartheta(\tau_1)\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t-h}^\vartheta \le q^\vartheta(\tau_2)\}}), \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1),$$

where $q^\vartheta(\tau)$ denotes X_t^ϑ's marginal quantile of order τ.

These cross-covariances always exist; their collection (for $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1)$) provides a canonical characterization of the joint copula of $(X_t^\vartheta, X_{t-h}^\vartheta)$, hence, an approximate (in the sense of (2.1)) description of the joint copula of all couples of the form $(X_{t,T}, X_{t-h,T})$. Therefore we also call $\gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ the *time-varying lag-h-copula cross-covariance kernel* of $\{X_{t,T}\}$. If we assume that, for all $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1)$, the lag-h-covariance kernels $\gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ are absolutely summable, we moreover can define the *local* or *time-varying copula spectral density kernel* of $\{X_{t,T}\}$ as

$$\mathfrak{f}^\vartheta(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2) e^{-ih\omega}, \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1), \quad \omega \in (-\pi, \pi]. \tag{2.3}$$

The time-varying covariance kernel then admits the representation

$$\gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ih\omega} \mathfrak{f}^\vartheta(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) d\omega, \qquad \omega \in (-\pi, \pi], \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0,1).$$

Comparing those representations with the local spectral densities of Dahlhaus (1997), we see that the autocovariances of the approximating processes there are replaced by copulas. This indicates that the local spectral density kernels (2.3) can be viewed as a completely non-parametric generalization of classical L^2-based tools. In particular, those kernels can capture pairwise serial dependencies of arbitrary forms. For more detailed comparisons, we refer to Dette et al. (2015) and Kley et al. (2014).

In Section 5.4, we provide an additional theoretical justification for considering time-varying copula spectral density kernels by demonstrating that these kernels can be considered as approximations of indicator versions

$$\mathfrak{W}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) := \sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cov}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{\lfloor t_0+s/2\rfloor,T}\leq F^{-1}_{\lfloor t_0+s/2\rfloor;T}(\tau_1)\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{\lfloor t_0-s/2\rfloor,T}\leq F^{-1}_{\lfloor t_0-s/2\rfloor;T}(\tau_2)\}}\Big)\frac{e^{-i\omega s}}{2\pi} \quad (2.4)$$

of the so-called *Wigner-Ville spectrum* of $\{X_{t,T}\}$ (see Martin and Flandrin (1985)). Additional evidence for the usefulness of the concepts discussed here for data analysis is provided, via simulation and an analysis of the S&P 500 time series, in Section 4.

3 Estimation of local copula spectra

Given observations $X_{1,T},\ldots,X_{T,T}$, the classical approach to the estimation of the time-varying spectral density of a locally stationary time series consists in considering a subset of n data points centered around a time point t_0.

To formalize ideas, let m_T be a sequence of positive integers diverging to infinity as $T\to\infty$, and define the discrete neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{t_0,T} := \{t\in\mathbb{Z} : |t_0-t| < m_T\}$, with cardinality $n = n(m_T,T)$. Denoting by $\omega_{j,n} = 2\pi j/n, 1\leq j\leq \lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor$ the positive Fourier frequencies, let $\varphi_n : \omega\mapsto\varphi_n(\omega) := \omega_{j,n}$ be the piecewise constant function mapping $\omega\in(0,\pi)$ to the closest Fourier frequency, i.e. to the frequency $\omega_{j,n}$ such that $\omega\in(\omega_{j,n}-\frac{2\pi}{n},\,\omega_{j,n}+\frac{2\pi}{n}]$.

Defining

$$T(k) := \{t \in \mathcal{N}_{t_0,T} : t + k \in \mathcal{N}_{t_0,T}\}, \quad \tilde{F}_{t_0;T}(x) := \frac{1}{2m_T^{4/5}} \sum_{|t-t_0| \leq m_T^{4/5}} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq x\}},$$

and $\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau) := \tilde{F}^{-1}_{t_0;T}(\tau)$, consider the *local lag-window estimator* (at the Fourier frequencies $\omega_{j,n} = 2\pi j/n$)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_{j,n}, \tau_1, \tau_2) \; := \; & \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{|k| \leq n-1} K(k/B_n) e^{-i\omega_{j,n}k} \\ & \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T(k)} \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1 \Big) \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k;T} \leq \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2 \Big), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $B_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and $K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous in $x = 0$ and satisfies $K(0) = 1$ and $\lim_{|x| \to \infty} K(x) = 0$. In order to extend this estimator $\hat{f}_{t_0,T}(\cdot, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ to the interval $(0, \pi)$, let

$$\hat{f}_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) := \hat{f}_{t_0,T}(\varphi_n(\omega), \tau_1, \tau_2). \quad (3.2)$$

In Section 5.3, we prove that, under mild conditions on the bandwidth parameters and the underlying time series, the local lag-window estimators defined in (3.2) provide consistent and asymptotically normal estimates of the copula spectral density $\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$.

As pointed out by a referee, an interesting alternative to the estimation of local L^2 spectra is provided by the *pre-periodogram* concept introduced by Neumann and Von Sachs (1997) (see their equation (3.7)). The advantage of their approach lies in the fact that no localization in the time domain is required. Unfortunately, it does not apply in our context, due to the fact that our notion of local stationarity allows the marginal distribution to change over time. Marginal quantiles thus would still need to be estimated from local windows. For this reason, we do not consider pre-periodograms any further.

The next section is devoted to a numerical investigation of the properties of the proposed estimation procedures by means of a brief simulation study and a detailed analysis of the S&P 500 log returns series.

4 Simulations and an empirical study

One important practical aspect of the estimation of a quantile spectral density is the choice of a local window length n and a smoothing parameter B_n. In Section 5.3 and Theorem 5.1, we derive the asymptotic distribution of the estimator, which allows to derive an expression for the smoothing parameters that minimizes the asymptotic mean squared error (see Remark 5.3 for additional details). Those expressions, of course, cannot be readily used in practice, since they depend on the true, unknown time-varying copula spectral densities and their derivatives. Estimating such derivatives is more difficult than estimating the original spectral density, and a plug-in approach to bandwidth selection therefore seems difficult to implement. For the estimation of local L^2-spectra, an interesting alternative has been proposed by Cranstoun et al. (2002). Unfortunately, that approach relies on wavelets instead of local windows for performing the localization in time; whether it can be implemented here is not clear. For the implementation of our methodology, we propose a combination of different local window lengths and bandwidth parameters, with a local window length of at least $n = 512$ to ensure reasonable estimates of quantile spectra for 'extreme' quantiles.

4.1 Calibrating the color scale

As in Section 1, plots of time-varying spectral densities and their estimations are provided in the form of *time-frequency heatmaps*: the vertical axis in those plots represents frequencies ($0 \leq \omega/2\pi \leq 0.5$), the horizontal axis the span of time $1, \ldots, T$ over which the time-varying spectral quantities are estimated. All 3×3 figures in this section show the real and

$\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\alpha,\alpha)$	$\Im\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\beta,\alpha)$	$\Im\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\gamma,\alpha)$
$\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\beta,\alpha)$	$\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\beta,\beta)$	$\Im\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\gamma,\beta)$
$\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\gamma,\alpha)$	$\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\gamma,\beta)$	$\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\gamma,\gamma)$

Table 1: Patterns for the 3×3 time-frequency heatmaps in Figures 5-8 and 11; throughout, we use $\alpha = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.9$, with $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_0 \subset \{1, \ldots, T\}$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. For example, the top-right corner, in all those figures, displays a time-frequency plot of the imaginary parts of the collection $\left(\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.9, 0.1)\right)_{t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_0, \omega \in \Omega}$.

imaginary parts for different combinations of quantile orders, organized as shown in Table 1. The spectral values themselves (for $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau$), or their real and imaginary parts (for $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$) are represented via a continuous (τ_1, τ_2)-dependent color code, ranging from cyan and light blue (for *small* values) to dark blue, yellow, orange, and red (for *large* values). As explained below, this color code also has an interpretation in terms of significance of certain p-values. This latter interpretation requires a preliminary calibration step, though. Indeed, being 'small', for a $(\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau)-$periodogram value (which by nature is nonnegative real) does not have the same meaning as being 'small' for the imaginary or the real part of some $(\tau_1', \tau_2')-$cross-periodogram (for which negative values are possible): in order to make inter-frequency comparisons possible, a meaningful color code therefore has to be (τ_1, τ_2)-specific. We therefore introduce a distribution-free simulation-based calibration that fully exploits the properties of copula-based quantities.

To explain the idea behind this calibration step, consider plotting, for some subset $\mathcal{T}_0 \times \Omega$, $\mathcal{T}_0 \subset \{1, ..., T\}$ and $\Omega \subset (0, \pi)$, a collection $\left(\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)\right)_{t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_0, \omega \in \Omega}$ of the real parts (the imaginary parts are dealt with exactly the same way) of estimators computed from the realization $X_1, ..., X_T$ of some time series of interest. Assume that a bandwidth B_n and a window length n were used for the estimation. A color is then attributed to each value of

$\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ along the following steps:

(i) simulate $M = 10^4$ independent realizations $(U_{1,m},\ldots,U_{n,m})$, $m = 1,...,M$ of an i.i.d. sequence of random variables of length n (uniform over $[0,1]$, for instance—but, our method being distribution-free, this is not required);

(ii) for each of those M realizations, compute the estimator $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}^{U,m}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ of the local spectral density based on the same bandwidth B_n note that the number n of observations in each replication equals the window length used for our original collection.

(iii) define, for each $m = 1,...,M = 10^4$, the quantities

$$Q^m_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2) := \max_{\omega} \Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}^{U,m}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) \quad \text{and} \quad Q^m_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2) := \min_{\omega} \Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2),$$

and obtain the empirical 99.5% quantile $q_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2)$ of $(Q^m_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2))_{m=1,...,M}$ and the 0.5% quantile $q_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2)$ of $(Q^m_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2))_{m=1,...,M}$, respectively.

The color palette then is set as follows: all points $(t_0,\omega) \in \mathcal{T}_0 \times \Omega$ with $\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ value in $[q_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2), q_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2)]$ receive dark blue color. Next, letting

$$v_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2) := \min(\min_{t_0,\omega} \Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2), q_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2) - (q_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2) - q_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2))),$$
$$v_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2) := \max(\max_{t_0,\omega} \Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2), q_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2) + (q_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2) - q_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2))),$$

all points (t_0,ω) for which $\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ lies in the interval $[v_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2), q_{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2)]$ receive a color ranging, according to a linear scale, from cyan to light and dark blue, while the colors for the interval $[q_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2), v_{\max}(\tau_1,\tau_2)]$ similarly range from dark blue to yellow and red.

All our time-frequency heat diagrams thus have the following interpretation. For each given choice of (τ_1,τ_2) and a timepoint t_0, the probability, under the hypothesis of white noise, that the real (resp., the imaginary) part at time $t = t_0$ of the smoothed (τ_1,τ_2)-time-varying

periodogram lies entirely in the dark blue area is approximately 0.01. Hence, the presence of light blue, cyan or orange-red zones in a diagram indicates a significant (at probability level 1%) deviation from white noise behavior. The location of those zones moreover tells us where in the spectrum, and when in the period of observation, those significant deviations take place, along with an evaluation of their magnitude. The correspondence between the actual size of the estimate and the colors used is provided by the color scale on the right-hand side of each diagram.

This calibration method yields a universal distribution-free and model-free color scaling which at the same time provides (as far as dark blue regions are concerned) a hypothesis testing interpretation of the results. The same color code is used for the S&P500 data in Sections 1 and 4.3, as well as for the simulations in Section 4.2. Currently, an R-package containing the codes used here is in preparation. A preliminary version is available from the authors upon request.

4.2 Simulations

This section provides a numerical illustration of the performances of our estimators of the time-varying quantile spectral densities in several time-varying models that have been considered elsewhere in the literature. For each of those models, two arrays of time-varying copula cross-spectral densities are provided, side by side, in the form of time-frequency heat plots, for each combination of the quantile levels 0.1, 0.5, and 0.9, using the color code described in Section 4.1:

(a) the local lag-window estimators of the copula-based spectral densities, and

(b) the actual time-varying copula-based spectral densities (of which (a) provides an estimator).

The estimators in (a) are computed from one realization, of length $T = 2^{13}$, of the (non-stationary) process under consideration. Table 2 provides the bandwidths B_n and window lengths n used for each specific model. For K, we used the Parzen window

$$K(u) = \begin{cases} 1 - 6u^2 + 6|u|^3 & |u| \leq 0.5 \\ 2(1 - |u|)^3 & 0.5 \leq |u| \leq 1 \\ 0 & 1 < |u|. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

In each case, $\mathcal{T}_0$ and Ω were chosen as $\mathcal{T}_0 := \{n/2(k+1) | k = 0, \ldots, \lfloor 2(T-n)/n \rfloor\}$ and $\Omega := \{2\pi j/n | j = 1, ..., (n-2)/2\}$. The actual (cross-)spectral densities in (b) were obtained by simulating, for each t_0 in $\mathcal{T}_0$, $R = 1000$ independent replications, all of length 2^{11}, of the strictly stationary approximation $(X_t^{t_0/T})_{t=1,\ldots,2^{11}}$, computing the corresponding lag-window estimators $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}^r_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, say, $r = 1, ..., R$, and averaging them (over $r = 1, ..., R$) for each fixed $(t_0, \omega) \in \mathcal{T}_0 \times \Omega$.

The following four models were considered.



(a) Estimated cross-spectral densities (b) Actual cross-spectral densities (simulated)

Figure 5: Heatmaps of the gaussian time varying AR(2) process described in Section 4.2.1.



(a) Estimated cross-spectral densities

(b) Actual cross-spectral densities (simulated)

Figure 6: Heatmaps of the cauchy time varying AR(2) process described in Section 4.2.2.

Model	Bandwidth B_n	window length n
(1) time-varying Gaussian AR(2)	10	512
(2) time-varying Cauchy AR(2)	10	512
(3) time-varying Gaussian ARCH(1)	10	2048
(4) time-varying QAR(1)	10	2048

Table 2: The weights, bandwidths, and window lengths used in the estimation of the copula-based spectral densities in parts (a) of Figures 5-8.

4.2.1 Gaussian tvAR(2)

In Figure 5, we display the results for a classical Gaussian time-varying AR(2) process, taken from Dahlhaus (2012), with equation

$$X_{t,T} = 1.8\cos(1.5 - \cos(2\pi t/T))X_{t-1,T} - 0.81X_{t-2,T} + Z_t \tag{4.2}$$

and i.i.d. noise $Z_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Its strictly stationary approximation at $t_0 = \vartheta T$, $0 \leq \vartheta \leq 1$, is

$$X_t^{\vartheta} = 1.8\cos(1.5 - \cos(2\pi\vartheta))X_{t-1}^{\vartheta} - 0.81X_{t-2}^{\vartheta} + Z_t. \tag{4.3}$$

This process exhibits a time-varying periodicity which is clearly visible in the heat diagrams associated with the real parts of its time-varying copula-based spectral densities, displayed in the lower triangular part of Figure 5(b). The uniformly dark blue imaginary parts in the upper triangular part are a consequence of the fact that those imaginary parts actually are zero, since Gaussian processes are time-reversible [see Proposition 2.1 in Dette et al. (2015)]. Those spectral densities are quite well recovered by our estimator (Figure 5(a)). As expected, no additional information can be gained from observing different quantiles, since conditional distributions, hence all conditional quantiles, in Gaussian processes, get shifted by the same quantity.

4.2.2 Cauchy tvAR(2)

Figure 6 shows time-frequency heatmaps for the same time-varying AR(2) process, now driven by i.i.d. Cauchy innovations. This model violates the moment assumptions of classical spectral analysis. The imaginary parts of the spectra are shown in the upper triangular part of Figure 6(b); note that, due to time-irreversibility (see Hallin et al. 1988), the actual spectral density (b) exhibits significant yellow parts which, however, are too narrow to be picked up by our estimator (a). Also note the significant peak around zero appearing in the diagrams associated with extreme quantiles ($\tau_1, \tau_2 = 0.1$ and 0.9); they indicate persistence in tail events—a phenomenon that totally escapes traditional analyses.

4.2.3 tvARCH(1)

Figure 7 similarly displays results for a time-varying ARCH(1) model of the form

$$X_{t,T} = \sqrt{1/2 + (0.9t/T)X_{t-1,T}^2}Z_t$$

with i.i.d. noise $Z_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and its strictly stationary approximation at time $t_0 = \vartheta T$, $0 \le \vartheta \le 1$

$$X_t^\vartheta = \sqrt{1/2 + 0.9\vartheta (X_{t-1}^\vartheta)^2}\, Z_t.$$

In these stationary approximations, the influence of X_{t-1}^ϑ on the variance of X_t^ϑ gradually increases over time. This is reflected in the diagrams associated with extreme quantiles, but is not visible in the "median ones".

4.2.4 tvQAR(1)

Finally, Figure 8 shows the same heat diagrams for the QAR(1) (Quantile Autoregression) model of order one

$$X_{t,T} = [(1.9U_t - 0.95)(t/T) + (-1.9U_t + 0.95)(1 - (t/T))]X_{t-1,T} + (U_t - 1/2),$$

where the U_t's are i.i.d. uniform over $[0,1]$ (see Koenker and Xiao (2006)). The corresponding strictly stationary approximation at $t_0 = \vartheta T$, $0 \le \vartheta \le 1$, is

$$X_t^\vartheta = [(1.9U_t - 0.95)\vartheta + (-1.9U_t + 0.95)(1 - \vartheta)]X_{t-1}^\vartheta + (U_t - 1/2).$$

The gradient of the coefficient function in (4.2.4) changes slowly from $1.9\,U_t - 0.95$ to $-1.9\,U_t + 0.95$, so that the spectral densities associated with the lower quantiles for small values of t_0/T are the same as as those associated with the upper quantiles for $1 - t_0/T$, and vice versa.

4.3 Standard & Poor's 500

We now turn back to the S&P500 index series already considered in the introduction, with $T = 12992$ daily observations from 1962 through 2013 (differences of the logarithms of daily



(a) Estimated cross-spectral densities (b) Actual cross-spectral densities (simulated)

Figure 7: Heatmaps of the time varying ARCH(2) process described in Section 4.2.3.



(a) Estimated cross-spectral densities (b) Actual cross-spectral densities (simulated)

Figure 8: Heatmaps of the time varying QAR(1) process described in Section 4.2.4.

opening and closing prices for about 52 years). We applied the same estimation method as above: smoothing was performed with the same window function as described in Section 4.2 (see equation (4.1)), with bandwidth $B_n = 25$, window length $n = 512$, and the sets $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{256 + 256j | 0 \leq j \leq 49\}$ and $\Omega = \{2\pi j/256 | j = 0, ..., 255\}$. Calibration for the time-frequency heatmaps was performed as explained in Section 4.1.

The presence of yellow and red areas in more than 1% of of the t_0 values seriously challenges the general opinion that this series is white noise. Deviations from white noise behavior (dark blue) are particularly visible in the diagrams associated with tail quantile levels. Concentrating on the $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$ case, closer inspection of the diagram reveals



Figure 9: The $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$ local lag-window estimator of Figure 3; vertical dashed lines indicate historical financial crises, namely the Oil Crisis of 1973, the Black Monday (19.10.1987) which took place during the Savings and Loan Crisis in the USA, the bursting of the dot-com bubble in 2001 (followed by the early 2000s recession), and the 2007-2012 financial crisis.

a relation between low-frequency spectral peaks and financial crisis events: in Figure 9, horizontal white lines are identifying the Oil Crisis of 1973, the Black Monday (19.10.1987) which took place during the Savings and Loan Crisis in the USA, the bursting of the dot-com bubble in 2001 (followed by the early 2000s recession) and the financial crisis from 2007-2012. Those episodes seem to match the low-frequency peaks quite well, indicating an association between crises and a change in the dependence structure of low returns.

This apparent relation of low-frequency peaks to crises is confirmed when focusing the analysis on the corresponding periods. In Figure 10, we provide plots of the local lag-window estimators for $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$ before and after two of those four crises, the 2001 bursting of the dot-com bubble and the 2007 financial crisis. More precisely, for each of them, we



Figure 10: Single local lag-window estimators calculated before (dashed) and after (solid) the bursting of the dot-com bubble in 2001 (left) and the beginning of the financial crisis in 2007 (right); the dotted horizontal lines represent the values of $q_{\min}$ and $q_{\max}$ from Section 4.1(*iii*); smoothing and bandwidth choices as in Figure 3.

calculated local lag-window estimations using only observations before the critical date, and compared them to estimations using only observations taken after it. None of the pre-crisis curves indicates any significant deviation from white noise, whereas both post-crisis ones do. The interpretation is that crises, locally but quite suddenly, produce changes in the dependencies between low returns. As shown by Figure 9, that change eventually fades away—more slowly, though, than it has appeared. The atypical spectra in the late sixties are probably an indication that the market, at that time, was much smaller, and less efficient, than nowadays.

As pointed out by one of the referees, peaks in quantile spectral densities at low frequencies also can be caused by a time-varying variance. This fact was first observed by Li (2014). Note that, by definition, copula spectra are invariant under strictly increasing transformations of the marginals. The invariance of the corresponding estimators however, is limited to cases where the changes in the marginal distribution take place 'sufficiently slowly', at least on a scale comparable to the length of the local windows used for estimation. Plotting local variances of the S&P500 returns (estimated in local windows) indicates that the variance



Figure 11: Time-frequency heatmaps for the S&P500 log-returns (left column) and one realization of a tvARCH(0) (right column) process where the parameter is estimated as the time-varying variance of the S&P500. First row: $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$. Second row: $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.9$. Third row: imaginary parts ($\tau_1 = 0.1, \tau_2 = 0.9$).

changes on a scale of at most 100 observations, which is small compared to the window length needed to estimate a quantile spectrum (see Figure 12 in the online supplement).

To investigate whether fast changes in the variance can indeed produce the type of quantile spectral plots associated with the S&P500, we followed an approach by Li (2014). More precisely, we first estimated the time-varying variance $\hat{\sigma}_t := ..., t = 1, ..., 12992$ of the S&P500 on local windows of length 101 (see the online appendix for additional details).

With this estimated variance, we defined a time-varying process of the form

$$X_{t,T} = \hat{\sigma}_t Z_t, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\{Z_t\}_{t=1}^{12992}$ denote i.i.d. draws with replacement from the S&P500 standardized by their estimated standard deviation, i.e. from $\{Y_t/\hat{\sigma}_t\}_{t=1,...,12992}$ where $(Y_t)_{t=1,...,12992}$ denote the S&P500 returns. To see how well the time-varying copula spectrum of the S&P500 returns can be matched by the spectrum of the process $X_{t,T}$, we simulated $J = 1000$ independent copies of $X_{t,T}$ and, for each realization, we computed local estimators of the quantile spectrum, $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}$, say, $j = 1, ..., J$. Of those $J = 1000$ realizations, we selected one that produces quantile spectra matching those of the S&P500 return; details are given in the online appendix (Appendix A.2). For the sake of brevity, we restrict our comparison to the real parts of the quantile combinations $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \{(0.1, 0.1), (0.9, 0.9)\}$ and the imaginary parts corresponding to $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \{(0.1, 0.9)\}$. The corresponding time-frequency plots are shown in Figure 11. Comparing the first two row figures corresponding to the quantile levels $(0.1, 0.1)$ and $(0.9, 0.9)$, we see that applying our estimators to the time-varying process $X_{t,T}$ produces peaks at low frequencies. However, the tvARCH(0) model does not produce enough peaks in the $(0.1, 0.1)$-spectrum, thus failing to completely capture the strong dependence in negative returns which is one of the typical features of financial data.

Plotting the imaginary parts of the $(0.1, 0.9)$ S&P500 spectra shows significant deviations from white noise behavior, in particular during the periods 1965–1973 and 1995–2003. In contrast to that, the corresponding imaginary parts of the tvARCH(0) spectrum are virtually indistinguishable from those of a white noise spectrum. This indicates that the tvARCH(0) process does not provide an adequate description of the joint distribution of high and low returns. Additional evidence for the fact that a tvARCH(0) process fails to capture important aspects the dynamic features of the S&P500 returns is presented in the online appendix,

Section A.2. There, we provide a comparison of global quantile spectra computed from the complete data set with those of the S&P500 returns.

Summarizing our findings, a localized analysis of quantile spectra reveals features that can not be explained by a model based solely on fast local changes in variance. Note that more sophisticated models such as time-varying ARCH and GARCH processes have been suggested to describe financial data, see Fryzlewicz and Subba Rao (2014) for a recent contribution. It would be very interesting to compare the quantile spectra of such time-varying stochastic volatility processes with those of the S&P500 returns. Preliminary comparisons indicate that the structure of the imaginary parts of the S&P500 time series can not be explained by a time-varying GARCH model. Due to space limitations, we leave a deeper analysis of this issue to future research.

5 Theoretical properties of time-varying copula spectra and the local lag-window estimator

5.1 A brief comparison of local stationarity concepts

In this section, we provide a brief comparison of our concept of local stationarity with some other notions that have been previously discussed in the literature. Our concept does not require any moment assumptions. Therefore, it cannot be more general, nor less general, than any other one involving moment-based characterizations only. If, however, we adequately restrict the class of processes under study, comparisons become meaningful.

The first notion of local stationarity, pioneered by Dahlhaus (1997), is based on time-varying (second order) spectral representations. In time domain, this corresponds to processes which have an MA(∞) representation with time-varying coefficients. A formal definition of such processes is provided below. In Lemma 5.1 we show that, under assumptions

similar to those in Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006), such processes are locally strictly stationary in the sense of Definition 2.1.

A more general notion of local stationarity, which allows for nonlinear models, was first introduced by Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006) and Subba Rao (2006). Those authors show that time-varying ARCH processes and certain classes of time-varying recurrence equations can be locally approximated by a strictly stationary process. In Section 5.2 below, we give precise definitions of time-varying ARCH(∞) and GARCH(p, q) processes that, under suitable assumptions, are locally strictly stationary. Proofs of these resulats can be found in Section A.1.1. Those concepts were recently extended by Vogt (2012), who considers a general class of time-varying Markov models and weakens the moment conditions. Whether this new approach is suitable for defining a sensible local notion of copula spectral density is unclear. Another approach, which can be considered as a generalization of Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006) to nonlinear processes, is developed by Zhou and Wu (2009a, b), who consider processes of the form $X_{t,T} = G(t/T; \xi_t, \xi_{t-1}, \ldots)$ where $\{\xi_t\}$ is i.i.d. white noise and G some measurable function. This is considerably more general than Dahlhaus and Polonik (2006); whether it can be used in the context of a local notion of copula spectral density is unclear.

None of the notions of local stationarity above thus can be 'most general': which notion is most appropriate depends on the specific problem at hand. For the definition and analysis of time-varying copula spectra, however, Definition 2.1 seems to be the most appropriate one.

5.2 Examples of locally strictly stationary models

tvMA(∞) The tvMA(∞) processes proposed byDahlhaus and Polonik (2006) cover a wide range of popular linear time-series, such as tvARMA(p, q) models. Following Dahlhaus and

Polonik (2006), consider a process of the form

$$X_{t,T} = \mu(t/T) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{t,T}(j)\xi_{t-j}, \tag{5.1}$$

where ξ_t is i.i.d. white noise. We need the following assumptions.

(MA1) There exist functions $a(\cdot, j)$ and $\mu(\cdot) : (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\sup_{t,T} |a_{t,T}(j) - a(\frac{t}{T}, j)| \leq \frac{K}{Tl(j)}, \quad \sup_{u\in(0,1)} \left|\frac{\partial a(u,j)}{\partial u}\right| \leq \frac{K}{l(j)}, \text{ and } \sup_{u\in(0,1)} \left|\frac{\partial \mu(u)}{\partial u}\right| \leq K$$

where K is a finite constant (not depending on j) and $\sum_j 1/l(j) < \infty$. Furthermore, $\sup_{u\in(0,1)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |a(u,j)| < \infty$ and $\inf_{u\in(0,1)} |a(u,0)| > \rho > 0$.

(MA2) The random variables ξ_t have bounded density function f_ξ and finite expectation, and $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |x f_\xi(x)| \leq C_f$.

Lemma 5.1. *If Assumptions (MA1) and (MA2) hold, the tvMA(∞) process defined in* (5.1) *is locally strictly stationary in the sense of Definition 2.1, with stationary approximation* $X_t^\vartheta = \mu(\vartheta) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} a(\vartheta, j)\xi_{t-j}$.

tvARCH(∞) From Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006), a tvARCH process is defined by

$$X_{t,T} = \sigma_{t,T} Z_t, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \sigma_{t,T}^2 = a_0(t/T) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j(t/T) X_{t-j,T}^2, \tag{5.2}$$

where the Z_t's are i.i.d. random variables with $\mathbb{E}(Z_t) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Var}(Z_t) = 1$, distribution function F and density f. In the same paper, it is shown that $X_{t,T}^2$, if not $X_{t,T}$ itself, has an almost surely well-defined and unique expression in the set of all causal solutions of (5.2) if the following assumption holds.

(ARCH1) The coefficients a_j in (5.2) are non-negative and $\inf_{u\in(0,1)} a_0(u) > \rho$ for a constant $\rho > 0$. There exist constants $Q < \infty$, $M < \infty$, and $0 < \nu < 1$, and a positive sequence $l(j)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j/l(j) < \infty$, and

$$\sup_{u\in(0,1)} a_j(u) < Q/l(j), \quad Q\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 1/l(j) \leq (1-\nu) \text{ and } |a_j(u) - a_j(v)| < M|u-v|/l(j).$$

In general, equation (5.2) has no unique solution, as the sign of a solution $X_{t,T}$ associated with the almost surely well-defined (under assumption $(ARCH1)$) $X_{t,T}^2$ can be randomly either positive or negative.

To avoid this non-unicity problem, we require $\sigma_{t,T}$ in (5.2) to be positive. More precisely, we impose the following condition.

(ARCH2) For some constant $C_f < \infty$, $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |xf(x)| < C_f$, and $\sigma_{t,T} = \sqrt{\sigma_{t,T}^2}$.

Lemma 5.2. *If Assumptions (ARCH1) and (ARCH2) hold, a process $X_{t,T}$ satisfying equation* (5.2) *is locally strictly stationary in the sense of Definition 2.1, with stationary approximation $X_t^{\vartheta} = \sigma_t^{\vartheta} Z_t$, where $(\sigma_t^{\vartheta})^2 = a_0(\vartheta) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j(\vartheta)(X_{t-j}^{\vartheta})^2$.*

tvGARCH(p,q) Subba Rao (2006)similary defines a tvGARCH(p, q) process as

$$X_{t,T} = \sigma_{t,T} Z_t, \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma_{t,T}^2 = a_0(t/T) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} a_j(t/T) X_{t-j,T}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_j(t/T)\sigma_{t-j,T}^2, \qquad (5.3)$$

where Z_t are i.i.d. random variables with $\mathbb{E}(Z_t) = 0$, $\mathrm{Var}(Z_t) = 1$, distribution function F and density f. Parallel to (ARCH1) and (ARCH2), consider the following assumptions.

(GARCH1) The coefficients functions $a_j(u)$, $j = 0, \ldots, p$ and $b_j(u)$, $j = 1, \ldots, q$, are positive, Lipschitz continuous and satisfy, for some $0 < \mu < 1$ and $\rho > 0$,

$$\sup_{u\in(0,1)}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{p}a_j(u)+\sum_{i=1}^{q}b_j(u)\Big]<1-\mu,\quad\text{and}\quad\inf_{u\in(0,1)}a_0(u)>\rho. \tag{5.4}$$

(GARCH2) For some constant $C_f<\infty$, $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|xf(x)|\le C_f$, and $\sigma_{t,T}=\sqrt{\sigma^2_{t,T}}$.

Lemma 5.3. *If Assumptions (GARCH1) and (GARCH2) hold, a process $X_{t,T}$ satisfying equation* (5.3) *is locally strictly stationary in the sense of Definition 2.1, with stationary approximation $X_t^\vartheta=\sigma_t^\vartheta Z_t$, where $(\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2=a_0(\vartheta)+\sum_{j=1}^p a_j(\vartheta)(X_{t-j}^\vartheta)^2+\sum_{i=1}^q b_j(\vartheta)(\sigma_{t-j}^\vartheta)^2$.*

5.3 Asymptotic theory

Before proceeding with a derivation of the asymptotic properties of $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$, we are collecting here the main technical assumptions needed in the sequel.

Letting $(\Omega,\mathscr{A},\mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, denote by $\mathscr{B}$ and $\mathscr{C}$ subfields of $\mathscr{A}$. Define $\beta(\mathscr{B},\mathscr{C}):=\mathbb{E}\sup_{C\in\mathscr{C}}|\mathbb{P}(C)-\mathbb{P}(C|\mathscr{B})|$ and, for an array $\{Z_{t,T}:1\le t\in\mathbb{Z}\}$, let

$$\beta(k):=\sup_T\sup_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\beta(\sigma(Z_{s,T},s\le t),\sigma(Z_{s,T},t+k\le s)),$$

where $\sigma(Z)$ is the $\sigma-$field generated by Z. A process is called $\beta-$*mixing* or *uniform mixing* if $\beta(k)\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$.

For the lag-window function K in (3.1), we make the following assumption.

(K) The lag-window function K satisfies $\|K\|_\infty\le 1$, $K(0)=1$ and has support $[-1,1]$; its extension to $\mathbb{R}$ is d times continuously differentiable with $d\ge 2$. Additionally, K has 'characteristic exponent' $r>0$ [see Parzen (1957) or Priestley (1981)], that is, r is the largest integer such that $C_K(r):=\lim_{u\to 0}\big(1-K(u)\big)/|u|^r$ exists, is finite and non-zero.

(A1) The triangular array $\{X_{t,T}\}$ is $\beta-$mixing with mixing coefficients $\beta^{[X]}(k)=O(k^{-\delta})$ for some $\delta>1$. The same holds for $\{X_t^\vartheta\}$.

(A2) For any $\varepsilon > 0$ define

$$\rho_n(\varepsilon) := \Big(\frac{\varepsilon + n^{\frac{1}{1+\delta}}\varepsilon^2}{n}\log(n)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \vee (n^{-\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}}\log(n)), \tag{5.5}$$

with δ as in Assumption (A1). Assume that $\rho_n(T^{-2/5}) = o((nB_n)^{-1/2})$, $T^{-2/5} = o(B_n^{1/2}/n^{1/2})$ and

$$\frac{B_n^2}{n} + \frac{n^2}{T^2 B_n} + \frac{n^{1/2}B_n}{T} = o\Big(\frac{B_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}}\Big).$$

(A3) (i) For some $\gamma > 2$ and $T^{-2(\gamma-1)/5\gamma} = o(B_n^{1/2}n^{-1/2})$,

$$\sup_t \sup_{x,y} \Big|F_{t,t+k;T}(x,y) - F_{t;T}(x)F_{t+k;T}(y)\Big| = O(|k|^{-\gamma}).$$

(ii) $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |k|^r \sup_{u,\eta_1,\eta_2} |\gamma_k^u(\eta_1,\eta_2)| < \infty$, where the supremum is over a neighborhood of $(\vartheta, q^\vartheta(\tau_1), q^\vartheta(\tau_2))$.

(iii) For $2 \le p \le 8$, define

$$\kappa_p(s_1,...,s_{p-1}) := \sup_T \sup_{t\in\mathcal{N}_{t_0,T}} \sup_{x_1,...,x_p} |\mathrm{cum}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le x_1\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+s_1,T}\le x_2\}}, ..., \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+s_{p-1},T}\le x_p\}})|$$

$$\kappa_p^\vartheta(s_1,...,s_{p-1}) := \sup_{x_1,...,x_p} |\mathrm{cum}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_0^\vartheta\le x_1\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{s_1}^\vartheta\le x_2\}}, ..., \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{s_{p-1}}^\vartheta\le x_p\}})|;$$

assume moreover that the quantities $\kappa_p(s_1,...,s_{p-1})$ and $\kappa_p^\vartheta(s_1,...,s_{p-1})$ are absolutely summable over $s_1,...,s_{p-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(A4) (i) The joint distribution functions $F_{t_1,...,t_j;T}$ of $(X_{t_1;T},...,X_{t_j;T}), j = 2,...,4$ are twice continuously differentiable, and all partial derivatives of order one and two are bounded, uniformly in $t_1,...,t_j, T$ and the arguments. The distribution function $F_{t_1;T}$ is twice continuously differentiable and its derivatives are bounded uniformly in t_1 and T.

(ii) Let $\mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)}\mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y) := \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}|k|^r\gamma_k^u(x,y)e^{-\mathrm{i}k\omega}$, where r is taken from Assumption (K). The function $(u,x,y)\mapsto\mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)}\mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y)$ is continuous in a neighborhood of $(u,x,y)=(\vartheta,q^\vartheta(\tau_1),q^\vartheta(\tau_2))$.

(iii) The function $u\mapsto\mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)))$ is twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of $u=\vartheta$.

(iv) The functions G_k^u and G^u in the definition of strict local stationarity are, for some $d\geq 2$, d times continuously differentiable with respect to u. The function G^ϑ has a density, which is uniformly bounded away from zero on an open set that contains $q^\vartheta(\tau_1),q^\vartheta(\tau_2)$.

Remark 5.1. Assumptions (K) and (A2) place mild restrictions on the lag-window generator K and the bandwidth parameter, respectively. One can show that they are satisfied by the bandwidth parameters leading to optimal asymptotic MSE rates for the mean squared error, see the discussion in Remark 5.3 for more details. Assumption (A3) is verified if δ from (A1) is large enough: in fact, it is sufficient to replace the β-mixing coefficients from (A1) by α-mixing coefficients (see Lemma A.3.1 in the online Appendix for additional details on bounding cumulants through α-mixing coefficients). Assumption (A4) places conditions on the smoothness properties of the underlying processes.

Remark 5.2. Observe that

$$\mathfrak{f}^u\big(\omega,G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)\big)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-ik\omega}\big(G_k^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_1),q^\vartheta(\tau_2))-G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_1))G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_2))\big).$$

This means that the differentiability of $u\mapsto\mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)))$ depends on the local smoothness with respect to time of joint distributions.

Our main result states that, after proper centering and scaling, $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ is asymptotically (complex) normal.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Assumptions (K) and (A1)-(A4) hold. Then, for any sequence ω_n of Fourier frequencies such that $|\omega_n - \omega| = O(1/n)$ for some $\omega \in (0,\pi)$, and for $t_0 = \lfloor T\vartheta \rfloor$,*

$$\sqrt{n/B_n}\begin{pmatrix} \Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \Re\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \Re b(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) \\ \Im\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \Im\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \Im b(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}\big(0,\Sigma^2(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)\big) \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$\Sigma^2(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) := \pi\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_1)\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_2,\tau_2)\int K^2(u)du\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$b(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) := -C_K(r)B_n^{-r}\mathfrak{d}_{\omega}^{(r)}\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) + \frac{n^2}{2T^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}\mathfrak{f}^{u}(\omega,G^u(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)),G^u(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)))\Big|_{u=\vartheta} + o(B_n^{-r}+\frac{n^2}{T^2}).$$

Remark 5.3. The results in Theorem 5.1 can be used to obtain the local window length n and the bandwidth parameter B_n that minimize the asymptotic mean squared error of $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2)$. To illustrate the idea, assume that we want to optimize the asymptotic mean squared error (MSE) of $\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2)$. Considering $r = d$, let $\sigma^2 := \Sigma^2_{11}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$,

$$b_u := \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}\mathfrak{f}^{u}(\omega,G^u(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)),G^u(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)))\Big|_{u=\vartheta} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\omega} := -C_K(r)\mathfrak{d}_{\omega}^{(r)}\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2).$$

In this notation the asymptotic MSE of $\Re\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ is $\frac{B_n}{n}\sigma^2 + b_u\frac{n^2}{T^2} + b_{\omega}B_n^{-r}$. Assuming that $b_u \neq 0$ and $b_{\omega} \neq 0$, straightforward calculations show that this expression is minimized for

$$n = T^{1-\frac{r}{2+5r}}\Big(\sigma^2 b_{\omega}^{-1/r}b_u^{2+1/r}(2r+4)\Big(\frac{r}{2}\Big)^{\frac{-r}{r+1}}\Big)^{\frac{r}{2+5r}},$$
$$B_n = T^{\frac{2}{2+5r}}\Big(\sigma^{-2}b_u^{-1/2}b_{\omega}^{5/2}(2r+4)\Big)^{\frac{2}{2+5r}}\Big(\frac{2}{r}\Big)^{\frac{-3}{2+5r}}.$$

As one would expect, larger values of r, corresponding to smoother local spectral densities (as functions of frequency), lead to more smoothing and faster convergence rates. In the case $r = 2$, the asymptotic MSE of $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ turns out to be of the order $T^{-2/3}$. One can show that, for δ in Assumption (A1) large enough, the above choices of the bandwidth parameters satisfy condition (A2) if $r \geq 2$. The above formulas provide rough guidelines about the choice of smoothing parameters. However, the expression for the bias contains unknown parameters, such as derivatives of the local copula spectral density kernel, which are difficult to estimate in practice.

5.4 Relation to the Wigner-Ville Spectra

In this section, we provide a theoretical justification for considering the time-varying copula spectral density kernel by establishing a connection to a classical concept from the analysis of locally stationary time series. In particular, we show that the time-varying copula spectral density kernel $\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, as defined in (2.3), is unique and provides a local spectral description of the non-stationary process under study, which justifies the terminology *time-varying copula spectral density* of $\{X_{t,T}\}$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\{X_{t,T}\}$ be locally strictly stationary with approximating processes $\{X_t^{\vartheta}\}$, and assume that Assumption (A1) holds. If moreover the $\gamma_h^{\vartheta}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$'s are absolutely summable for any $\vartheta, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0, 1)$, then, for any fixed $\vartheta, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in (0, 1)$ and any sequence $t_0 = t_0(T)$ such that $t_0/T \to \vartheta$,*

$$\sup_{\omega \in (-\pi, \pi]} \left| \mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathfrak{W}_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) \right| = o(1).$$

where $\mathfrak{W}_{t_0,T}$ denotes the Wigner-Ville spectrum of the indicators defined in (2.4).

For more information about the Wigner-Ville spectrum, its properties and applications, see Martin and Flandrin (1985).

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have introduced a new notion of strict local stationarity that allows us to define and estimate local copula-based spectra. Those copula-based spectra have been shown, in a stationary context, to provide a description of serial dependence structures which is by far more comprehensive and flexible than classical covariance-based spectra. The benefits of this new spectral methodology are thus extended to slowly evolving dependence structures. Those benefits are highlighted in a simulation study, and by an analysis of the daily log-returns of the classical S&P500 series. That analysis indeed reveals many interesting features that escape a more traditional L^2-based approach.

Several important questions are calling for further research, though. Our method does not escape the problem of smoothing parameter choice—an issue which is common to all methods based on local stationarity concepts. It seems important to have some data-driven procedure providing general guidelines on what a 'good' choice of smoothing parameters is. A very interesting approach to such choices has been proposed recently by Cranstoun et al. (2002) in the time-varying parameter context. It certainly would be worth to extend that approach to the present setting. It also is important to develop methods that allow to conduct uniformly (in frequency and local time) valid inference on quantile spectra. This is challenging, though, and to the best of our knowledge no such methodology is available even for the simpler case of classical L^2 spectra. Finally, it is natural to assume that the dependence structure of a time series contains both smooth changes and sudden jumps. In the present paper, we have dealt with smooth changes only, and an extension accommodating possible jumps would be most welcome. Again, this question seems to be open even in the

case of classical L^2 spectra, and any progress in that direction would be highly desirable.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to the Associate Editor and three anonymous referees for their careful reading of the manuscript and for their constructive comments which led to significant improvements.

References

Azrak, R. and Mélard, G. (2006). Asymptotic properties of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for ARMA models with time-dependent coefficients. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes*, 9:279–330.

Bougerol, P. and Picard, N. (1992). Stationarity of GARCH processes and some nonnegative time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 52:115–127.

Briggs, W. L. and Henson, V. E. (1995). The dft. an owners manual for the discrete fourier transform. *SIAM. Society for Industrial & Applied Mathematics*.

Brillinger, D. R. (1975). *Time Series. Data Analysis and Theory*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Brockwell, P. and Davis, R. (1998). *Time Series: Theory and Methods*. Springer.

Cranstoun, S. D., Ombao, H. C., Von Sachs, R., Guo, W., and Litt, B. (2002). Time-frequency spectral estimation of multichannel eeg using the auto-slex method. *Biomedical Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 49(9):988–996.

Dahlhaus, R. (1997). Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes. *Annals of Statistics*, 25(1):1–37.

Dahlhaus, R. (2012). Locally Stationary Processes. *arXiv:1109.4174*.

Dahlhaus, R. and Polonik, W. (2006). Nonparametric quasi-maximum likelihood estimation for Gaussian locally stationary processes. *Annals of Statistics*, 34:2790–2824.

Dahlhaus, R. and Subba Rao, S. (2006). Statistical inference for time-varying arch processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(3):1075–1114.

Davis, R. A., Lee, T., and Rodriguez-Yam, G. (2005). Structural break estimation for nonstationary time series models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101:223–239.

Davis, R. A. and Mikosch, T. (2009). The extremogram: A correlogram for extreme events. *Bernoulli*, 15:977–1009.

Davis, R. A., Mikosch, T., and Zhao, Y. (2013). Measures of serial extremal dependence and their estimation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 123:2575–2602.

Dette, H., Hallin, M., Kley, T., and Volgushev, S. (2015). Of copulas, quantiles, ranks and spectra: An L_1 approach to spectral analysis. *Bernoulli*, 21(2):781–831.

Fryzlewicz, P., Sapatinas, T., and Subba Rao, S. (2008). Normalised least-squares estimation in time-varying ARCH models. *Annals of Statistics*, 36:742–786.

Fryzlewicz, P. and Subba Rao, S. (2014). Multiple-change-point detection for auto-regressive conditional heteroscedastic processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: series B (statistical methodology)*, 76(5):903–924.

Giraitis, L., Kokoszka, P., and Leipus, R. (2000). Stationary ARCH Models: Dependence Structure and Central Limit Theorem. *Econometric Theory*, 16:3–22.

Hagemann, A. (2011). Robust spectral analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1111.1965*.

Hallin, M., Lefèvre, C., and Puri, M. L. (1984). On time-reversibility and the uniqueness of moving average representations for non-gaussian stationary time series. *Biometrika*, 75:170–171.

Han, H., Linton, O., Oka, T., and Whang, Y.-J. (2014). The cross-quantilogram: measuring quantile dependence and testing directional preeictability between time series. *available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2338468*.

Harvey, A. C. (2010). Tracking a changing copula. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 17:485–500.

Hong, Y. (1999). Hypothesis testing in time series via the empirical characteristic function: A generalized spectral density approach. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1201–1220.

Hong, Y. (2000). Generalized spectral tests for serial dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B.*, 62:557–574.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2):263–291.

Kley, T., Volgushev, S., Dette, H., and Hallin, M. (2014). Quantile spectral processes: Asymptotic analysis and inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.8104*.

Koenker, R. and Xiao, Z. (2006). Quantile autoregression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):980–1006.

Kosorok, M. R. (2007). *Introduction to empirical processes and semiparametric inference*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Lee, J. and Subba Rao, S. (2012). The quantile spectral density and comparison based tests for nonlinear time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1112.2759v2*.

Li, T.-H. (2008). Laplace periodogram for time series analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482):757–768.

Li, T.-H. (2012). Quantile periodograms. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(498):765–776.

Li, T.-H. (2014). Quantile periodogram and time-dependent variance. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 35(4):322–340.

Linton, O. and Whang, Y.-J. (2007). The quantilogram: with an application to evaluating directional predictability. *Journal of Econometrics*, 141:250–282.

Martin, W. and Flandrin, P. (1985). Wigner-Ville Spectral Analysis of Nonstationary Processes. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 33:1461 – 1470.

Nason, G. P., Von Sachs, R., and Kroisandt, G. (2000). Wavelet processes and adaptive estimation of the evolutionary wavelet spectrum. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 62:271–292.

Neumann, M. H. and Von Sachs, R. (1997). Wavelet thresholding in anisotropic function classes and application to adaptive estimation of evolutionary spectra. *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(1):38–76.

Parzen, E. (1957). On consistent estimates of the spectrum of a stationary time series. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 28(2):329–348.

Priestley, M. B. (1965). Evolutionary spectra and non-stationary processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 27:204–237.

Priestley, M. B. (1981). *Spectral Analysis and Time Series*. Academic Press.

Rosenblatt, M. (1984). Asymptotic normality, strong mixing and spectral density estimates. *The Annals of Probability*, 12(4):1167–1180.

Schuster, A. (1898). On the investigation of hidden periodicities with application to a supposed 26 day period of meteorological phenomena. *Terrestrial Magnetism*, 3:13–41.

Subba Rao, S. (2006). On Some Nonstationary, Nonlinear Random Processes and Their Stationary Approximations. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 38(4):1155–1172.

Subba Rao, T. (1970). The fitting of non-stationary time series models with time-dependent parameters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B.*, 32:312–322.

Vogt, M. (2012). Nonparametric regression for locally stationary time series. *Annals of Statistics*, 40(5):2601–2633.

Yu, B. (1994). Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *Annals of Probability*, 22:94–116.

Zhou, Z. and Wu, W. B. (2009a). Local linear quantile estimation for nonstationary time series. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:2696 – 2729.

Zhou, Z. and Wu, W. B. (2009b). Nonparametric inference of discretely sampled stable Léevy processes. *Annals of Statistics*, 153:83–92.

Online Appendix

In this online appendix, we collect the proofs and the technical details for the main body of the paper. In Section A.1, we provide proofs for Theorem 5.1 and show local strict stationarity for the models in Section 5.2. Section A.2 provides additional information on the comparison of a tvARCH(0) and the loacally stationary copula-based spectral approach in the analysis of the S&P500 returns(Section 4.3). Section A.3 contains a collection of probabilistic results (on cumulants and a blocking technique) that are used throughout the proofs of Section A.4 and the main results. In Section A.4, we provide detailed proofs of some intermidiate results entering the proof of Theorem 5.1 in Section 5.3.

A.1 Proofs for the main results

A.1.1 Proofs of the results in Section 5.2

We begin by some preliminary comments. Assume that $X_{t,T}$ and X_t^{ϑ} are defined on the same probability space. Writing the distribution function in terms of expectation and indicator functions leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|F_{t_1,t_2;T}(x_1,x_2) - G^{\vartheta}_{t_2-t_1}((x_1,x_2))| \\
&\quad = |\mathbb{E}(\prod_{1\le j\le 2} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_j,T}\le x_j\}} - \prod_{1\le j\le p} \mathbb{I}_{\{(X^{\vartheta}_{t_j})\le x_j\}})| \\
&\quad \le \sum_{k=1}^{2} |\mathbb{E}(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_j,T}\le x_j\}}[\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_k,T}\le x_k\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{(X^{\vartheta}_{t_k})\le x_k\}}] \prod_{j=k+1}^{p} \mathbb{I}_{\{(X^{\vartheta}_{t_j})\le x_j\}})| \\
&\quad \le \sum_{k=1}^{2} \mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_k,T}\le x_j\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{(X^{\vartheta}_{t_k})\le x_j\}}|).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, in order to prove Lemma 5.1-5.3, it is sufficent to show that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{(X_t^\vartheta)\leq x\}}|) \leq L\big(\big|\frac{t}{T} - \vartheta\big| + \frac{1}{T}\big).$$

A.1.1.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

By Assumption $(MA1)$ we have $\sup_{\vartheta\in(0,1)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |a(\vartheta, j)| < \infty$ which by standard arguments implies strict stationarity of the process X_t^ϑ (see for example Brockwell and Davis (1998) Proposition 3.1.1). Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mu(\vartheta) = 0$. Denoting by $\mathcal{A}$ the $\sigma-$field generated by $\{\xi_s | s \neq 0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{(X_t^\vartheta)\leq x\}}|) \\
&\quad\leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^\vartheta\leq x\}}|\big|\mathcal{A})\big] \\
&\quad\leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{\xi_t\leq \frac{1}{a_{t,T}(0)}\{x-\sum_{j\neq 0} a_{t,T}(j)\xi_{t-j}\}\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{\xi_t\leq \frac{1}{a(\vartheta,0)}\{x-\sum_{j\neq 0} a(\vartheta,j)\xi_{t-j}\}\}}|\big|\mathcal{A})\big] \\
&\quad= \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[|F_\xi(\frac{1}{a_{t,T}(0)}\{x - \sum_{j\neq 0} a_{t,T}(j)\xi_{t-j}\}) - F_\xi(\frac{1}{a(\vartheta,0)}\{x - \sum_{j\neq 0} a(\vartheta,j)\xi_{t-j}\})|] \\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{E}[C_1|a_{t,T}(0) - a(\vartheta,0)| + C_2||S_{t,T} - S_t^\vartheta|],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$S_{t,T} := \sum_{j\neq 0} a_{t,T}(j)\xi_{t-j}, \quad S_t^\vartheta := \sum_{j\neq 0} a(\vartheta,j)\xi_{t-j},$$

and the last inequality follows from the two dimensional mean-value theorem. To be more precise,

$$\left|F_\xi\left(\frac{x-v}{u}\right) - F_\xi\left(\frac{x-v'}{u'}\right)\right| \leq \left|\int_0^1 f_\xi\left(\frac{x-v_t}{u_t}\right)\frac{x-v_t}{u_t^2}dt\right||u-u'| + \left|\int_0^1 f_\xi\left(\frac{x-v_t}{u_t}\right)\frac{1}{u_t}dt\right||v-v'|,$$

with $u_t = u + t(u'-u)$ and $v_t = v + t(v'-v)$. From Assumption (MA2) the integrals are bounded by constants C_1 and C_2 which are independent of x. Straightforward calculations, under the assumptions made, lead to

$$\mathbb{E}[|S_{t,T} - S_t^\vartheta|] = \mathrm{O}(|t - \vartheta T^{-1}| + T^{-1}),$$

which completes the proof. □

A.1.1.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Observe that Assumptions (ARCH1) imply that

$$\sup_{\vartheta\in(0,1)} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j(\vartheta)Z_j^2) < 1, \tag{A.1}$$

which is sufficient for the existence and uniqueness of a strictly stationary solution $(X_t^\vartheta)^2$ with finite first moment(see Giraitis et al. (2000) Theorem 2.1). Now $(ARCH1)$ yields $\sum_j |a_j(\vartheta)| < \infty$, which implies that $(\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2$ is locally strictly stationary (Proposition 3.1.1 Brockwell and Davis (1998) again). Let $\sigma_t^\vartheta = \sqrt{(\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2}$ and set $X_t^\vartheta = \sigma_t^\vartheta Z_t$. To prove local strict stationarity, it suffices to bound $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^\vartheta \leq x\}}|)$. Denoting by $\mathcal{A}_t$ the

$\sigma-$algebra generated by $(Z_t, Z_{t-1}, \dots)$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big(\big|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^\vartheta \le x\}}\big|\big) = \mathbb{E}\big(\mathbb{E}\big[\big|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^\vartheta \le x\}}\big|\Big|\mathcal{A}_{t-1}\big]\big)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\big(\mathbb{E}\big[\big|\mathbb{I}_{\{Z_t\le x/\sigma_{t,T}\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{Z_t\le x/\sigma_t^\vartheta\}}\big|\Big|\mathcal{A}_{t-1}\big]\big) \le \mathbb{E}\big(\big|F(x/\sigma_{t,T}) - F(x/\sigma^\vartheta)\big|\big)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\big(\big|\int_{\sigma_{t,T}}^{\sigma_t^\vartheta} xy^{-1}f(xy^{-1})y^{-1}dy\big|\big) \le \mathbb{E}\big(C\big|\sigma_{t,T} - \sigma_t^\vartheta\big|\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $(ARCH2)$ and the fact that $\min(\sigma_{t,T}, \sigma_t^\vartheta) > \rho$. Now, as Z_t is independent of $(\sigma_{t,T}, \sigma_t^\vartheta)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(|\sigma_{t,T}^2 - (\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2|) = \mathbb{E}(|\sigma_{t,T}^2 - (\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2|Z_t^2) = \mathbb{E}(|X_{t,T}^2 - (X_t^\vartheta)^2|) \le C\Big(\big|\frac{t}{T} - \vartheta\big| + \frac{1}{T}\Big)$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 1 in Dahlhaus and Subba Rao (2006). Noting again that $\min(\sigma_{t,T}, \sigma_t^\vartheta)$ is bounded away from zero, we have, for some appropriate constant C,

$$\mathbb{E}(|\sigma_{t,T} - \sigma_t^\vartheta|) \le C\mathbb{E}(|\sigma_{t,T}^2 - (\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2|). \qquad \square$$

A.1.1.3 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Assumption $(GARCH1)$ implies that

$$\sup_{u\in[0,1]} \mathbb{E}(Z_t^2)\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_j(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_j(u)\Big] < 1$$

which is sufficent for the existence of a strictly stationary solution X_t^ϑ (see the Remark after Corollary 2.2 in Bougerol and Picard (1992)). Similar calculations as in the tvARCH case yield $\mathbb{E}(|\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^\vartheta \le x\}}|) \le \mathbb{E}(C|\sigma_{t,T}^2 - (\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2)$ and a bound on $\mathbb{E}(|\sigma_{t,T}^2 - (\sigma_t^\vartheta)^2|)$ follows as in Section 5.2. (top of page 1168) in Subba Rao (2006). $\square$

A.1.2 Proof of Lemma 5.4

From the absolute summability of $\gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2)$, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{f}^\vartheta(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h=-T^{1/4}}^{T^{1/4}} \gamma_h^\vartheta(\tau_1, \tau_2) e^{-i\omega h} + o(1),$$

while Assumption (A1) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{W}_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h=-T^{1/4}}^{T^{1/4}} \Big(F_{\lfloor t_0 - h/2 \rfloor, \lfloor t_0 + h/2 \rfloor; T}(F^{-1}_{\lfloor t_0 - h/2 \rfloor; T}(\tau_1), F^{-1}_{\lfloor t_0 + h/2 \rfloor; T}(\tau_2)) - \tau_1 \tau_2 \Big) e^{-i\omega h} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Writing the difference of the leading term above in terms of distribution functions yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h=-T^{1/4}}^{T^{1/4}} |F_{\lfloor t_0 - h/2 \rfloor, \lfloor t_0 + h/2 \rfloor; T}(F^{-1}_{\lfloor t_0 - h/2 \rfloor; T}(\tau_1), F^{-1}_{\lfloor t_0 + h/2 \rfloor; T}(\tau_2)) - G_h^\vartheta(q^\vartheta(\tau_1), q^\vartheta(\tau_2))| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{h=-T^{1/4}}^{T^{1/4}} \frac{L}{g_{min}} \Big| \frac{h}{T} + \frac{1}{T} \Big| = o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma A.3.2 in the online supplement. □

A.1.3 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Proof of Theorem 5.1 The proof proceeds in several steps, which we briefly outline here; details are provided in Section A.4 of the online appendix. First, we establish that the

estimator $\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau)$ can be replaced with the true quantile levels τ, that is,

$$\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{|k|\leq n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega_n k} \times \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}}-\tau_1\Big)\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}}-\tau_2\Big)+o_P((B_n/n)^{1/2}), \tag{A.2}$$

uniformly in $\omega_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)$ denotes the set of all Fourier frequencies in the interval $(\varepsilon, \pi-\varepsilon)$. Second, we prove that, uniformly again in $\omega_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)$,

$$\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) + O_P\Big(\frac{B_n^2}{n}+\frac{n^2}{T^2B_n}+\frac{n^{1/2}B_n}{T}\Big) \tag{A.3}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) := \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|k|\leq n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega_n k}\sum_{|t-t_0|\leq m_T-B_n} Y_{t,\tau_1}Y_{t+k,\tau_2}$$

and $Y_{t,\tau} := \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau)\}} - F_{t;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau))$. The advantage of this representation lies in the fact that the random variables $\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - F_{t;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))$ are centered, which considerably simplifies some of the computations that follow. Next, observe that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega_n,\tau_1,\tau_2) = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) + O_P(B_n/n)$$

since $|\omega_n-\omega| = O(1/n)$. Finally, we prove that

$$\sqrt{B_n/n}\begin{pmatrix} \Re\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \Re\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) \\ \Im\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \Im\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)\end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma^2(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)) \tag{A.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) =& \mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - C_K(r)B_n^{-r}\mathfrak{d}_{\omega}^{(r)}\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) \\ &+ \frac{n^2}{2T^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}\mathfrak{f}^{u}(\omega,G^u(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)),G^u(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)))\Big|_{u=\vartheta} \\ &+ o(B_n^{-r}+n^2/T^2)+O(1/n).\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

Taken together, this completes the proof of the theorem. □

A.2 Additional details on a comparison of the S&P500 log-returns with a tvARCH(0) process

A.2.1 The 'best' in tvARCH(0) fit of S&P500

To simulate the tvARCH(0) processes in Section 4.3, we estimated the time-varying variance from log-returns $Y_1,\dots,Y_T$ by

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \frac{1}{2n+1}\sum_{s=1}^{T}\bar{K}\big(\frac{s-t}{n}\big)\Big(Y_t - \frac{1}{2n+1}\sum_{|l-t|\le n}Y_l\Big)^2$$

where $\bar{K}$ is the Parzen window from equation (4.1) (multiplied with 4/3 so that it integrates to one). For estimating the time-varying variance of the log-returns of the S&P500, we chose $n = 50$, which yields a fast changing function that is still sufficiently smooth (see Figure 12). Note that, to calculate σ_t^2 for $t = 1,\dots,12992$, we need 13092 observations of the S&P500 from 1962-01-02 to 2014-01-03. We omitted this additional data in the rest of the paper to keep all pictures consistent. For our investigation, we created $J = 1000$ time series as defined

in (4.4) and for each calculated a collection of local lag-window estimators $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2),\ j = 1, ..., J$ by using the same windows and bandwidths as for the log-returns of the S&P500. We want to concentrate on the real parts of $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.1, 0.1)$ and $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.9, 0.9)$, and on the imaginary part of $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.9, 0.1)$. To find the 'best match", denote by $\hat{f}_{t_0,T}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ the local lag-window estimator of the S&P500 log-returns and calculate, for all $j = 1, \ldots, J$, the L^2 distance

$$d_1(j) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sum_{t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_0} [\Re \hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.1, 0.1)) - \Re \hat{f}_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.1, 0.1)]^2.$$

Denote by $d_2(j)$ and $d_3(j)$ the same distances for the real parts of $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.9, 0.9)$ and the imaginary part of $\hat{f}^j_{t_0,T}(\omega, 0.9, 0.1)$ respectively. Define the 'best match" as the realization j_{min} which minimizes the sum $d_1(j) + d_2(j) + d_3(j)$.



Figure 12: Estimated time-varying variance of the log-returns of the S&P500.



Figure 13: Log-returns of the S&P500 between 1963 and 2013 and the simulated tvARCH(0) process that was selected as the 'best match".

A.2.2 A comparison of 'global' tvARCH(0) and S&P500 spectra

In this section, we provide a comparison of the 'global' spectra, i.e. spectra computed from the complete dataset without localization, of the S&P500 returns with those of the process $X_{t,T}$ defined in equation (4.4). We simulated $J = 1000$ independent replications of the process $X_{t,T}$, and for each replication we computed the 'global' lag-window estimator by letting

$$\mathcal{N}_{t_0,T} := \{1, \ldots, T\}.$$

We thus obtained a collection of estimators $(\hat{f}^j)_{j=1,\ldots,J}$ based on the bandwidth $B_n = 25$ and the same lag-window function as in the analysis of the S&P500 log returns. Next, for each $\omega \in \{\frac{2\pi j}{6496} | j = 0, \ldots, 6495\}$ and $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \{0.1, 0.5, 0.9\}$, we computed the 1% quantile $q^{\Re}_{min}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ of $(\Re\hat{f}^j(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2))_{j=1,\ldots,J}$ and 99% quantile $q^{\Re}_{max}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ of $(\Re\hat{f}^j(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2))_{j=1,\ldots,J}$. The quantiles $q^{\Im}_{max}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, $q^{\Im}_{max}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ were computed similarly.

Quantile spectra computed from the S&P500 dataset (in black) are depicted in Figure 14, together with the estimators $\hat{f}^j(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, $j = 1, ..., 10$ (red lines) and gray areas covering, for each (ω, τ_1, τ_2), the intervals $[q_{min}, q_{max}]$. As predicted by the analysis of Li (2014), the

$\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.9$ quantile spectral densities of the tvARCH(0) process have prominent peaks around frequency zero. Observe, however, that those peaks are typically higher than those of the S&P500 for $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.1$ and (slightly) lower for $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.9$. Additionally, the estimators $\Re\hat{f}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ for $(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (0.1, 0.5)$ and $(0.9, 0.5)$ and $\Im\hat{f}(\omega, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ for $(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (0.1, 0.5), (0.1, 0.9)$ and $(0.5, 0.9)$ lie well outside the gray 'confidence' areas for a wide range of frequencies. This indicates that the tvARCH(0) process does not provide an adequate description of the (global) dynamic features of the S&P500 returns.

It is natural to wonder if the mismatch between this simple time-varying variance model and the S&P500 data is due to a structural difference between the S&P500 dynamics back in the seventies and in 'modern' times. To address this question, we replicated the procedure described above for the S&P500 returns corresponding to the time period 2000-2013. The corresponding results are displayed in Figure 15. While the estimators of the $(0.1, 0.1)$ and $(0.9, 0.9)$ spectra are now (just barely) within the gray 'confidence' areas, we still observe highly significant deviations between the imaginary part of the ARCH(0) and S&P500 spectra for the quantile combination $(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (0.1, 0.9)$ and between the real parts for $(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (0.5, 0.9)$.



Figure 14: A comparison of global lag-window estimations of the quantile spectra of the S&P500 (over the period 1962-2013; black lines) and those obtained from simulated tvARCH(0) processes (red lines, with grey-shaded pointwise confidence regions).



Figure 15: Same as Figure 14, with S&P500 observations restricted to the period 2000-2013.

A.3 Some probabilistic details

A.3.1 A Lemma on cumulants

Lemma A.3.1. *For an arbitrary stochastic process* $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$*, let*

$$\alpha(n) := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \sup_{A\in\sigma(..X_{t-1},X_t),B\in\sigma(X_{t+n},X_{t+n+1},...)} |\mathbb{P}(A\cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|.$$

Then, for any $t_1,...,t_p \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and any* p*-tuple Borel sets* $A_1,...,A_p$ *there exists a constant* K_p *depending on* p *only such that*

$$\Big|\mathrm{cum}(I\{X_{t_1}\in A_1\},\ldots,I\{X_{t_p}\in A_p\})\Big| \le K_p\alpha\Big(\big\lfloor p^{-1}\max_{i,j}|t_i-t_j|\big\rfloor\Big).$$

Proof Recall that, by the definition of cumulants,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\mathrm{cum}(I\{X_{t_1} \in A_1\}, \ldots, I\{X_{t_p} \in A_p\})| \\
&= \Big| \sum_{\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_R\}} (-1)^{R-1}(R-1)! \mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcap_{i \in \nu_1} \{X_{t_i} \in A_i\} \Big) \cdots \mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcap_{i \in \nu_R} \{X_{t_i} \in A_i\} \Big) \Big|, \qquad \text{(A.6)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the summation runs over all partitions $\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_R\}$ of the set $\{1, \ldots, p\}$.

In the case $t_1 = ... = t_p$, the Lemma is obviously true. If at least two indices are distinct, choose j with $\max_{i=1,\ldots,p-1}(t_{i+1} - t_i) = t_{j+1} - t_j > 0$ and let $(Y_{t_{j+1}}, \ldots, Y_{t_p})$ be a random vector that is independent of $(X_{t_1}, \ldots, X_{t_j})$ and possesses the same joint distribution as $(X_{t_{j+1}}, \ldots, X_{t_p})$. By an elementary property of the cumulants (cf. Theorem 2.3.1 (iii) in Brillinger (1975)), we have

$$
\mathrm{cum}\big(I\{X_{t_1} \in A_1\}, \ldots, I\{X_{t_j} \in A_j\}, I\{Y_{t_{j+1}} \in A_{j+1}\}, \ldots, I\{Y_{t_p} \in A_p\}\big) = 0.
$$

Therefore, we can write, for the cumulant of interest,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big| \mathrm{cum}(I\{X_{t_1} \in A_1\}, \ldots, I\{X_{t_p} \in A_p\}) \\
&\quad - \mathrm{cum}(I\{X_{t_1} \in A_1\}, \ldots, I\{X_{t_j} \in A_j\}, I\{Y_{t_{j+1}} \in A_{j+1}\}, \ldots, I\{Y_{t_p} \in A_p\}) \Big| \\
&= \Big| \sum_{\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_R\}} (-1)^{R-1}(R-1)! [P_{\nu_1} \cdots P_{\nu_R} - Q_{\nu_1} \cdots Q_{\nu_R}] \Big|,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the sum again runs over all partitions $\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_R\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$,

$$
P_{\nu_r} := \mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcap_{i \in \nu_r} \{X_{t_i} \in A_i\} \Big) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{\nu_r} := \mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcap_{\substack{i \in \nu_r \\ i \le j}} \{X_{t_i} \in A_i\} \Big) \mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcap_{\substack{i \in \nu_r \\ i > j}} \{X_{t_i} \in A_i\} \Big),
$$

$r = 1, \ldots, R$, with $\mathbb{P}(\bigcap_{i \in \emptyset} \{X_{t_i} \in A_i\}) := 1$ by convention. By the definition of $\alpha(n)$, it

follows that $|P_{\nu_r} - Q_{\nu_r}| \leq \alpha(t_{j+1} - t_j)$ for any partition $\nu_1, ..., \nu_R$ and any $r = 1, ..., R$. Thus, for every partition $\nu_1, ..., \nu_R$,

$$|P_{\nu_1} \cdots P_{\nu_R} - Q_{\nu_1} \cdots Q_{\nu_R}| \leq \sum_{r=1}^{R} |P_{\nu_r} - Q_{\nu_r}| \leq R\alpha(t_{j+1} - t_j).$$

All together, this yields

$$|\text{cum}(I\{X_{t_1} \in A_1\}, \ldots, I\{X_{t_p} \in A_p\})| \leq \alpha(t_{j+1} - t_j) \sum_{\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_R\}} R! \ .$$

Noting that $p(t_{j+1} - t_j) \geq \max_{i_1, i_2} |t_{i_1} - t_{i_2}|$ and observing that α is a monotone function, we obtain

$$|\text{cum}(I\{X_{t_1} \in A_1\}, \ldots, I\{X_{t_p} \in A_p\})| \leq K_p \alpha(\max |t_i - t_j|). \quad \square$$

Lemma A.3.2. *Let F and G denote functions on the real line, with $|G(x) - G(y)| > c|x - y|$ for $x, y \in [a, b]$ where c is some positive constant. For all $p, q \in (a, b)$, with $F(p) = G(q)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, $||F(\cdot) - G(\cdot)||_\infty \leq \epsilon$ implies $|p - q| \leq \epsilon/c$.*

Proof The claim follows from the fact that

$$c|p - q| < |G(p) - G(q)| = |G(p) - F(p)| \leq \epsilon. \quad \square$$

A.3.2 A blocking technique for nonstationary $\beta-$mixing processes

In her paper, Yu (1994) constructed an independent block (IB) technique to transfer the classical tools from the i.i.d. case to the case of $\beta-$mixing stationary time series. We are using the same technique here to derive results for sums of $\beta-$mixing local stationary time series, which will be used on multiple occasions. For this purpose, let $X_{t,n}$ be a triangular

scheme of $\beta-$mixing processes with mixing coefficient β_n. For each fixed n we will divide the process $X_{t,n}$ into $2\mu_n$ alternating blocks with lengths p_n and q_n, respectively, and a remainder block of length $n - 2\mu_n(p_n + q_n)$. More precisely, divide the index set into $(2\mu_n + 1)$ parts

$$\Gamma_j = \{t : t_{min} + B_n + (j-1)(p_n+q_n) + 1 \le t \le t_{min} + B_n + (j-1)(p_n+q_n) + p_n\}$$
$$\Delta_j = \{t : t_{min} + B_n + (j-1)(p_n+q_n) + p_n + 1 \le t \le t_{min} + B_n + j(p_n+q_n)\}$$
$$R = \{t : t_{min} + B_n + \mu_n(p_n+q_n) + 1 \le t \le t_{min} + n - B_n\},$$

and introduce the notation

$$X(\Gamma_j) = \{X_{i,n}, i \in \Gamma_j\}, \quad X(\Delta_j) = \{X_{i,n}, i \in \Delta_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad X(R) = \{X_{i,n}, i \in R\},$$

where the dependence on n is omitted for the sake of brevity. We now have a sequence of alternating $X(\Gamma_j)$ and $X(\Delta_j)$ blocks, and a remainder block $X(R)$:

$$X = X(\Gamma_1), X(\Delta_1), X(\Gamma_2), \ldots, X(\Gamma_{\mu_n}), X(\Delta_{\mu_n}), X(R).$$

To exploit the concept of coupling, we consider a one-dependent block sequence

$$Y = Y(\Gamma_1), Y(\Delta_1), Y(\Gamma_2), \ldots, Y(\Gamma_{\mu_n}), Y(\Delta_{\mu_n}),$$

where $Y(\Gamma_j) = \{\xi_i : i \in \Gamma_j\}$ and $Y(\Delta_j) = \{Y_i : i \in \Delta_j\}$ such that the sequence is independent of X and each block of Y has the same distribution as the corresponding block in X, that is,

$$Y(\Gamma_i) \stackrel{d}{=} X(\Gamma_i) \quad \text{and} \quad Y(\Delta_i) \stackrel{d}{=} X(\Delta_i),$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ stands for equality in distribution.

The existence of such a sequence and the measurability issues that arise are addressed in Yu (1994). The $\Gamma-$ and $\Delta-$block subsequences are denoted by $X_\Gamma, Y_\Gamma, X_\Delta$ and Y_Δ, respectively: for instance,

$$X_\Gamma := X(\Gamma_1), X(\Gamma_2), \ldots, X(\Gamma_{\mu_n}).$$

We obtain X_Γ by leaving out every other block in the original sequence, which is $\beta-$mixing, so that the dependence between the blocks in X_Γ becomes weaker as the size p_n of the $\Gamma-$blocks increases. The following lemma from Yu (1994) establishes an upper bound for the difference between the Γ block sequences from the original process and the independent block sequence.

Lemma A.3.3. *For any measurable function h on $\mathbb{R}^{\mu_n q_n}$ with $\|h\|_\infty \leq M$, we have, for the blocking structure just described,*

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_Q[h(X(\Delta))] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}}[h(Y(\Delta))]\right| \leq M(\mu_n - 1)\beta_{p_n} \quad \textit{and}$$
$$\left|\mathbb{E}_Q[h(X(\Gamma))] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}}[h(Y(\Gamma))]\right| \leq M(\mu_n - 1)\beta_{q_n}.$$

Proof. We only prove the first claim, which follows as an application of Corrolary 2.7 in Yu (1994) with Q being the probability distribution of the Δ_j block sequence. However, note that the $\beta-$mixing rate of Q here is less than β_{p_n}, due to the alternating block length. □

Next, we consider a special case of the same blocking technique with $a_n := q_n = p_n$, now applied to a sum of $\beta-$mixing random variables, namely $\sum_{t=1}^{n} f(X_{t,n})$, and link its probabilistic behavior to that of the sum of the independent blocks $\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i \in \Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n})$. To avoid measurability issues the function f is assumed to belong to a permissable class F_n of functions (for a definition see the appendix in Yu (1994)). Furthermore, for the sake

of simplicity, assume that $\mathbb{E}(f(X_{i,n})) = 0$ for all $f \in F_n$. The following Lemma is a slight adjustment of Lemma 4.2 from Yu (1994).

Lemma A.3.4. *Let F_n be a sequence of permissible function classes, which are bounded by a constant M_n. If a sequence $(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is such that, for n large enough, $2r_n\mu_n \geq nM_n$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{t=1}^{n} f(X_{t,n})\big| > 4r_n\Big) \leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) + \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Delta_j} f(Y_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) + 2\mu_n\beta_{a_n}. \tag{A.7}$$

Proof The probability in the left-hand side of $(A.7)$ splits into three parts: namely,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{t=1}^{n} f(X_{t,n})\big| > 4r_n\Big) \leq{}& \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(X_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Delta_j} f(X_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{i\in R} f(X_{i,n})\big| > 2r_n\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The sum appearing in the third part, which deals with the ramainder block, is bounded by $M_n(2a_n) \leq M_n n/\mu_n$. As $2r_n\mu_n \geq nM_n$, that probability is zero.

Turning to the first part, Lemma $A.3.3$ with h the indicator function of the event

$$\Big\{ \sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(X_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big\}$$

yields

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(X_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) \leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) + \mu_n \beta_{a_n},$$

the second term can be treated by the same arguments. The claim follows. □

The upper bound in Lemma A.3.4 is based on i.i.d. blocks, which allows us to use classical techniques. In particular, we will apply the Benett inequality to further bound the sum of $\beta-$mixing random variables. For this purpose assume that the number of functions $m_f(n)$ contained in F_n is finite, so that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n})\big|\Big) \leq m_f(n) \sup_{f\in F_n} \mathbb{P}\Big(\big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big).$$

Furthermore, let us assume that the variance $\mathrm{Var}(\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n}))$ of the blocks is bounded by some finite V_n, so that the Benett inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\big| \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(Y_{i,n})\big| > r_n\Big) \leq \exp\Big(- \frac{\mu_n V_n}{a_n^2 M_n^2} h\Big(\frac{r_n a_n M_n}{2\mu_n V_n}\Big)\Big), \tag{A.8}$$

where $h(x) = (1+x)log(1+x)$. Calculations similar to those in the proof of Lemma 6.7 in Dette et al. (2015) we can bound the probability by

$$\exp\Big(- \frac{\log 2}{2}\Big(\frac{r_n^2}{4\mu_n V_n} \wedge \frac{r_n}{2a_n M_n}\Big)\Big).$$

We just have proven the following Lemma

Lemma A.3.5. *Let $X_{t,n}$ be a triangular array of $\beta-$mixing random variables and F_n a*

sequence of finite function classes with cardinality $\#F_n$ that fulfills

$$(i)\#F_n \le m_f(n), \quad (ii)\sup_{f\in F_n}|f(X_{t,n})| \le M_n \quad \textit{and} \quad (iii)\ \mathbb{E}(f(X)) = 0$$

Assume a blocking structure with block length $a_n := p_n = q_n$ which divides the index set into $2\mu_n + 1$ parts, where $n/2 - a_n \le \mu_n a_n \le n/2$, $a_n \to \infty$ and $\mu_n \to \infty$, satisfying

(a) $\mu_n \beta_{a_n} \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} 0$,

(b) $2r_n\mu_n \ge nM_n$ *and*

(c) $\mathrm{Var}(\sum_{i\in\Gamma_j} f(X_{i,n})) \vee \mathrm{Var}(\sum_{i\in\Delta_j} f(X_{i,n})) \le V_n$ *for all* $1 \le j \le \mu_n$.

If these conditions are met we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{f\in F_n}\Big|\sum_{t=1}^{n} f(X_{t,n})\Big| > 4r_n\Big) \le 2m_f(n)\exp\Big(-\frac{\log 2}{2}\Big(\frac{r_n^2}{4\mu_n V_n} \wedge \frac{r_n}{2a_n M_n}\Big)\Big) + o(1).$$

A.3.3 Auxiliary technical results

Lemma A.3.6. *Assume that $M_T \to \infty$, $T/M_T \to 0$ and $t_0/T \to \vartheta \in (0,1)$. Under Assumptions (A1)-(A4), for any bounded $S \subset \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\Big(\sqrt{2M_T}\Big(\frac{1}{2M_T}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le M_T}(I\{X_{t,T} \le x\} - F_{t,T}(x))\Big)\Big)_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{B} \quad \textit{in} \quad \ell^\infty(S)$$

where $\mathbb{B}$ denotes a centered Gaussian process with covariances

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{B}(s)\mathbb{B}(t)] = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\big(G_k^\vartheta(x,y) - G^\vartheta(x)G^\vartheta(y)\big).$$

Proof In order to prove the weak convergence we need to establish asymptotic equicontinuity and convergence of finite dimensional distributions (see Theorem 2.1 in Kosorok

(2007)). Convergence of finite dimensional distributions follows as an application of Lemma A.3.3 the arguments are quite standard and omitted for the sake of brevity. To prove asymptotic equicontinuity, we apply Lemma 7.1 from Kley et al. (2014). More precisely, consider the process $H_n(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2M_T}} \sum_{|t-t_0|\leq M_T} (I\{X_{t,T} \leq x\} - F_{t,T}(x))$, where n denotes the cardinality of the set $\{t \in \{1,\dots,T\} : |t-t_0| \leq M_T\}$. Then,

$$H_n(x) - H_n(y) = \sum_{|t-t_0|\leq M_T} W_{t,T}(x,y)$$

where

$$W_{t,T}(x,y) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2M_T}}\Big(I\{X_{t,T} \leq x\} - F_{t,T}(x) - (I\{X_{t,T} \leq y\} - F_{t,T}(y)))\Big).$$

Since $\mathbb{E}W_{t,T}(x,y) = 0$ for all x, y, by the definition of cumulants, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|H_n(x) - H_n(y)|^4 = 3\Big(\mathrm{cum}_2\Big(\sum_{|t-t_0|\leq M_T} W_{t,T}(x,y)\Big)\Big)^2 + \mathrm{cum}_4\Big(\sum_{|t-t_0|\leq M_T} W_{t,T}(x,y)\Big)$$

where $\mathrm{cum}_k(y) := \mathrm{cum}(y,...,y)$. Assumption (A3)(iii) implies that

$$\mathrm{cum}_4\Big(\sum_{|t-t_0|\leq M_T} W_{t,T}(x,y)\Big) = O(1/M_T)$$

while, under Assumption (A3)(i), there exist constants C and $\tilde{C}$ such that

$$\Big|\mathrm{cum}_2\Big(\sum_{|t-t_0|\leq M_T} W_{t,T}(x,y)\Big)\Big| \leq |x-y| + C\sum_{s\geq 1} \min(|x-y|, s|^\gamma) \leq \tilde{C}|x-y|^{1-\gamma^{-1}}$$

where the last equality follows by (A.18). Thus, there exists a constant C such that, for

$|x-y| \geq 1/M_T^{1/2}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}|H_n(x) - H_n(y)|^4 \leq C|x-y|^{2-2\gamma^{-1}}.$$

Now, fix $\delta > 0$ and apply Lemma 7.1 from Dette et al. (2015) with $\Psi(x) = x^4$, $d(x,y) := |x-y|^{(\gamma-1)/(2\gamma)}$, $\bar{\eta} := (2/n)^{(\gamma-1)/(2\gamma)}$, $\mathbb{G}_x := H_n(x)$ and $T := S$. In particular, the packing number of the bounded set S with respect to the metric d can be bounded by $D(\varepsilon, d) \leq C\varepsilon^{-2\gamma/(\gamma-1)}$ for some constant C independent of ε. This yields

$$\sup_{x,y\in S, d(x,y)\leq\delta} |H_n(x) - H_n(y)| \leq S_1 + 2 \sup_{x,y\in S, d(x,y)\leq\bar{\eta}} |H_n(x) - H_n(y)| \tag{A.9}$$

where the quantity S_1 satisfies

$$\|\mathbb{E}S_1^4\|^{1/4} \leq K\Big[\int_{\bar{\eta}/2}^{\eta} \varepsilon^{-\gamma/2(\gamma-1)} d\varepsilon + (\delta + 2\bar{\eta})\eta^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)}\Big]. \tag{A.10}$$

Note that $\gamma > 2$ implies $\gamma/2(\gamma-1) < 1$, so that $\varepsilon^{-\gamma/2(\gamma-1)}$ is integrable on $[0,1]$. In particular, setting $\eta := \delta^{(\gamma-1)/(2\gamma)}$ implies $\delta\eta^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)} = \delta^{1/2}$, hence

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|\mathbb{E}S_1^4\|^{1/4} = 0.$$

Finally, note that similar arguments as in the proof of (A.14) entail

$$\sup_{x,y\in S, d(x,y)\leq\bar{\eta}} |H_n(x) - H_n(y)| = o_P(1). \tag{A.11}$$

Jointly, (A.9)-(A.11) imply that, for any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} P\Big(\sup_{x,y\in S, d(x,y)\leq\delta} |H_n(x) - H_n(y)| \geq \alpha \Big) = 0.$$

Since the metric d makes the index set S totally bounded, condition (ii) in Theorem 2.1 in Kosorok (2007) follows. This, together with the weak convergence of the finite dimensional distributions, completes the proof. □

Lemma A.3.7. *Let $\ell_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a sequence such that $\omega_{\ell_n} := 2\pi\ell_n/n \to \omega \not\equiv 0 \mod 2\pi$. Let K be a function satisfying assumption (K) and define $K_n(k) := K(k/B_n)$, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $B_n = o(n)$. Denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)$ the set of Fourier frequencies which are contained in $(\varepsilon, \pi - \varepsilon)$. Assume that condition (A4)(iv) holds. Then*

$$\sup_{\omega\in\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{N}_{t_0,T}} \sup_{\tau} \Big| \sum_{|k|\le B_n} K_n(k)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega k}\big(F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau)) - \tau\big)\Big| = O\Big(\frac{n}{TB_n^{d-1}} + B_n/T\Big)$$

and

$$\sup_{\omega\in\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)} \Big| \sum_{|k|\le B_n} K_n(k)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega k}\Big| = O\Big(\frac{1}{B_n^{d-1}}\Big).$$

Proof: We only establish the first statement since the second one can be proved by similar arguments. Let $h_{t,T}(u) := K\big(u\frac{n}{B_n}\big)[G^{\frac{t}{T}+u\frac{n}{T}}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau)) - \tau]$, $u \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ for T large enough that $|un/B_n| \le 1$ and $\frac{k}{T} + u\frac{n}{T} \in [0,1]$. Note that, under the assumptions made, this function has support $[-B_n/n, B_n/n]$ and is d times continuously differentiable as a function on $(-1/2, 1/2)$. Due to local stationarity the following approximation holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{|k|\le B_n} K\Big(\frac{k}{B_n}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega k}[F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau)) - \tau] \\
&\quad= \sum_{k=-n/2+1}^{n/2} K\Big(\frac{k}{n}\frac{n}{B_n}\Big)[G^{\frac{t}{T}+\frac{k}{n}\frac{n}{T}}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau)) - \tau]\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega k} + O(B_n/T) \\
&\quad= \sum_{k=-n/2+1}^{n/2} h_{t,T}(k/n)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega k} + O(B_n/T).
\end{aligned}$$

By Leibniz's rule, we have

$$h_{t,T}^{(d)}(u) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{d}{j} \Big(\frac{n}{B_n}\Big)^j \Big(\frac{n}{T}\Big)^{d-j} K^{(j)}\Big(u\frac{n}{B_n}\Big) \frac{\partial^{d-j}}{\partial v^{d-j}} G^{\frac{t}{T}+v}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau))\Big|_{v=u\frac{n}{T}},$$
$$+ \Big(\frac{n}{B_n}\Big)^d K^{(d)}\Big(u\frac{n}{B_n}\Big)\Big(G^{\frac{t}{T}+u\frac{n}{T}}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau)) - \tau\Big)$$

so that, under the assumptions made, for some constant C_d depending only on K, d and $u \mapsto G^u(q_\tau)$,

$$\sup_{t,T,u} |h_{t,T}^{(d)}(u)| \leq C_d (n/B_n)^d \frac{n}{T}.$$

Note that, under the assumptions of the lemma the function $u \mapsto h_{t,T}(u)$ is twice continuously differentiable on $(-1/2, 1/2)$. Thus, it admits the Fourier series representation

$$h_{t,T}(u) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} c_{j,t,T} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}2\pi j u}, \quad \text{where } c_{j,t,T} := \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} h_{t,T}(u)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}2\pi j u}\mathrm{d}u.$$

Now consider a Fourier frequency $\omega_\ell = 2\pi\ell/n \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)$. By the usual argument (see Briggs and Henson (1995), page 182), we have the discrete Poisson summation formula

$$\sum_{k=-n/2+1}^{n/2} h_{t,T}(k/n)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega_\ell k} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} c_{j,t,T} \sum_{k=-n/2+1}^{n/2} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}2\pi k(j-\ell)/n}$$
$$= n\Big(c_{\ell,t,T} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(c_{\ell+kn,t,T} + c_{\ell-kn,t,T})\Big).$$

For the leading term, note that $h_{t,T}^{(r)}(u) = 0$ for $|u| > B_n/n$, so that, integrating by parts yields

$$c_{\ell,t,T} = (-1)^{d+1} \frac{1}{(\mathrm{i}2\pi\ell)^d} \int_{-B_n/n}^{B_n/n} h_{t,T}^{(d)}(u)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}2\pi\ell u}\mathrm{d}u. \tag{A.12}$$

It follows that $|c_{\ell,t,T}| \leq 2C_p(2\pi\ell)^{-d}\frac{n}{T}(n/B_n)^{d-1} \lesssim \frac{1}{TB_n^{d-1}}$, as $\ell \asymp n$. Furthermore, by Assumption (A4)(iv) (recall that $d \geq 2$ and $\ell/n \to c \in (0,1) \bmod 1$),

$$\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(c_{\ell+kn,t,T} + c_{\ell-kn,t,T})\Big| \lesssim \frac{n}{T}\Big(\frac{n}{B_n}\Big)^{d-1}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1}{(\ell+kn)^d} + \frac{1}{(\ell-kn)^d}\Big)$$
$$= \frac{1}{TB_n^{d-1}}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1}{(\ell/n+k)^d} + \frac{1}{(\ell/n-k)^d}\Big) \lesssim \frac{1}{TB_n^{d-1}}.$$

Note that all the bounds above hold uniformly in $\ell \asymp n$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

A.4 Details for the proof of Theorem 5.1

A.4.1 Proof of (A.2)

Define

$$\hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(x,y) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x, X_{t+k,T}\leq y\}},$$

and let

$$r_{n,1}(k) := \hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1),\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)) - \hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1),q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))$$
$$-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(F_{t,t+k;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1),\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)) - F_{t,t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1),q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big),$$
$$r_{n,2}(k) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big[F_{t,t+k;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1),\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)) - F_{t;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1))F_{t+k;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2))$$
$$-\Big(F_{t,t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1),q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)) - F_{t;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big)\Big],$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{n,3}(k) &:= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(F_{t;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1))F_{t+k;T}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)) - F_{t;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big),\\
r_{n,4}(k) &:= \frac{\tau_1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\le \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2\Big) + \frac{\tau_2}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\\
&\quad -\frac{\tau_1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2\Big) - \frac{\tau_2}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that, due to the assumptions on K_n,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\pi\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \sum_{|k|\le n-1}K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2\Big)\\
&\quad = \sum_{|k|\le B_n}K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\Big(r_{n,1}(k) + r_{n,2}(k) + r_{n,3}(k) + r_{n,4}(k)\Big)\\
&\quad =: R_{n,1} + R_{n,2} + R_{n,3} + R_{n,4}, \text{ say.}
\end{aligned}
$$

To prove (A.2) it is sufficient to establish the following statements:

$$
\max(|q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1) - \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1)|, |q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2) - \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)|) = O_P(T^{-2/5}), \tag{A.13}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_k\sup_{x\in X}\sup_{\|y\|\le\varepsilon_n}\Big|\hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(x) - \hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(x+y) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)}[F_{t,t+k;T}(x) - F_{t,t+k;T}(x+y)]\Big|\\
&\qquad = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\rho_n(\varepsilon_n)),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.14}
$$

for any $\varepsilon_n = o(1)$ and any bounded set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|v\|$ denoting the maximum norm of the vector v, and

$$
\sup_{x\in Z}\sup_{|y|\le\varepsilon_n}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le x\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le x+y\}} - F_{t;T}(x) + F_{t;T}(x+y)\Big)\Big| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\rho_n(\varepsilon_n)) \tag{A.15}
$$

for any $\varepsilon_n = o(1)$ and any bounded set $Z \subset \mathbb{R}$ where ρ_n is defined in (5.5). We first analyze the asymptotic behaviour of the four remainder terms $R_{n,1}, R_{n,2}, R_{n,3}, R_{n,4}$ and then present proofs for (A.13) - (A.15).

Discussion of remainder term $R_{n,1}$**.**
From (A.13) and (A.14), we obtain $\sup_k |r_{n,1}(k)| = O_P(\rho_n(T^{-2/5}))$ hence under (A3)

$$|R_{n,1}| = o_P(B_n^{1/2} n^{-1/2}). \tag{A.16}$$

Discussion of remainder term $R_{n,2}$**.**
Under (A3)(i) and (A4)(i), $|r_{n,2}(k)| = O(\min(|k|^{-\gamma}, T^{-2/5}))$, and thus

$$|R_{n,2}| \leq \sum_{|k| \leq B_n} O(\min(|k|^{-\gamma}, T^{-2/5})) = O(T^{-(1-\gamma^{-1})2/5}) = o(B_n^{1/2} n^{-1/2}). \tag{A.17}$$

To see the this, note that, for $\varepsilon \to 0$,

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \min(k^{-\gamma}, \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \varepsilon^{-1/\gamma}} \varepsilon + \sum_{k \geq \varepsilon^{-1/\gamma}} k^{-\gamma} = O(\varepsilon^{1-1/\gamma}) + O(\varepsilon^{(-1/\gamma)(1-\gamma)}) = O(\varepsilon^{1-\gamma^{-1}}). \tag{A.18}$$

Discussion of remainder term $R_{n,3}$.

Start by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t\in T(k)} F_{t;T}(x)F_{t+k;T}(y) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T} F_{t;T}(x)F_{t+k;T}(y) + O(k/n) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T} G^{t/T}(x)G^{(t+k)/T}(y) + O(k/n) + O(1/T) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T} G^{t/T}(x)G^{t/T}(y) + O(k/T) + O(k/n) + O(1/T) \\
&= \frac{T}{2m_T}\int_{-m_T/T}^{m_T/T} G^{\vartheta+u}(x)G^{\vartheta+u}(y)du + O(k/n),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used a first-order Taylor expansion of the function $u \mapsto G^u(x)$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{n,3}(k) = \frac{T}{2m_T}\int_{-m_T/T}^{m_T/T} & G^{\vartheta+u}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1))G^{\vartheta+u}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)) \\
& - G^{\vartheta+u}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))G^{\vartheta+u}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))du + O(B_n/n),
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $|k| \le B_n$. Observe that, by Lemma A.3.7 under condition (K), we have

$$\sup_{\omega\in\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)}\Big|\sum_{|k|\le n-1} K_n(k)e^{-ik\omega}\Big| = O(1).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n3} =& \Big(\sum_{|k|\le B_n} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\Big)\frac{T}{2m_T}\int_{-m_T/T}^{m_T/T} G^{\vartheta+u}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1))G^{\vartheta+u}(\hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)) \\
& - G^{\vartheta+u}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))G^{\vartheta+u}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))du + O(B_n^2/n) \\
=& O\Big(\max\big(|q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1) - \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1)|, |q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2) - \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)|\big)\Big) + O(B_n^2/n)
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\omega \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)$, almost surely. Recalling (A.13) and Assumption (A2) we thus obtain

$$|R_{n,3}| = o_P(B_n^{1/2} n^{-1/2}). \tag{A.19}$$

Discussion of remainder term $R_{n,4}$.

Observe that, uniformly in $|k| \leq B_n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T(k)} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq y\}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|t-t_0| \leq m_T} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq y\}} + O_P(B_n/n), \\
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T(k)} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T} \leq y\}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|t-t_0| \leq m_T} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq y\}} + O_P(B_n/n).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, uniformly in $|k| \leq B_n$,

$$r_{n,4}(k) = D_n + O_P(B_n/n)$$

where

$$D_n := \sum_{|t-t_0| \leq m_T} \frac{\tau_1}{n} \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_2)\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} \Big) + \frac{\tau_2}{n} \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq \hat{q}_{t_0,T}(\tau_1)\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} \Big)$$

does not depend on k. In particular, by Lemma A.3.7 this implies

$$|R_{n,4}| \leq O_P(B_n^2/n) + |D_n| \sup_{\omega \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n(\varepsilon)} \Big| \sum_{|k| \leq n-1} K_n(k) e^{-ik\omega} \Big| = O_P(B_n^2/n) + |D_n| O(B_n^{-1}).$$

To conclude with $R_{n,4}$, note that combining (A.13), (A.15), and Assumption (A4)(i) we obtain $|D_n| = O_P(\rho_n(T^{-2/5})) + O_P(T^{-2/5})$. Together with (A2), this entails $R_{n,4} = o_P(B_n^{1/2}/n^{1/2})$ which, combined with (A.16)-(A.19), yields (A.2). It remains to establish (A.13) - (A.15).

Proof of (A.13) Letting $M_T = T^{4/5}$ in Lemma A.3.6, we obtain the weak convergence of $\sqrt{2T^{4/5}}(\tilde{F}_{t_0;T}(x) - \bar{F}(x))$, where

$$\bar{F}(x) := \frac{1}{2T^{4/5}} \sum_{|t-t_0|\leq T^{4/5}} F_{t;T}(x) = \frac{1}{2T^{4/5}} \sum_{|t-t_0|\leq T^{4/5}} G^{t/T}(x) + O(1/T).$$

to a centered Gaussian process with almost surely continuous sample paths. Next, observe that, uniformly in x,

$$\bar{F}(x) = \frac{T}{2T^{4/5}} \int_{-T^{4/5}/T}^{T^{4/5}/T} G^{\vartheta+u}(x)du + O(1/T) = G^{\vartheta}(x) + O((T^{4/5}/T)^2) + O(1/T)$$

where we have used a second-order Taylor expansion of the function $u \mapsto G^{\vartheta+u}(x)$. The claim (statement (A.13)) follows by compact differentiability of the quantile mapping, see Lemma 12.8 in Kosorok (2007).

Proof of (A.14) and (A.15) Statement (A.15) can be established by similar arguments as (A.14), and its proof is omitted for the sake of brevity. Let $x = (x_1, x_2)$, *deboting* $y = (y_1, y_2)$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} nW_{t,k}(x,y) := \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x_1, X_{t+k,T}\leq x_2\}} - \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\leq x_1+y_1, X_{t+k,T}\leq x_2+y_2\}} \\ - \mathbb{P}(X_{t,T}\leq x_1, X_{t+k,T}\leq x_2) + \mathbb{P}(X_{t,T}\leq x_1+y_1, X_{t+k,T}\leq x_2+y_2). \end{aligned}$$

With this notation, we have

$$\sum_{t\in T(k)} W_{t,k}(x,y) = \hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(x_1+y_1, x_2+y_2) - \hat{F}_{t_0,t_0+k;T}(x_1,x_2)$$

$$- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T(k)} F_{t,t+k;T}(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) - F_{t,t+k;T}(x_1, x_2).$$

Cover the bounded set $\{(x, y) : x \in X, \|y\| \leq \varepsilon_n\}$ with $O(n^4)$ spheres of radius $1/2n$ and centers (v, w) such that $\|w\| \leq \varepsilon_n$, and denote the set of resulting centers by Z. Observe that there exists a constant C independent of k such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\|(v,w)-(x,y)\| \leq 1/n} |W_{t,k}(v, w) - W_{t,k}(x, y)| \\
&\qquad \leq n^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{t,T}-v_1| \leq 1/n\}} + \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{t+k,T}-v_2| \leq 1/n\}} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{t,T}-v_1-w_1| \leq 1/n\}} + \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{t+k,T}-v_2-w_2| \leq 1/n\}} + C) \\
&\qquad := V_{t,k}(v, w).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{x \in X} \sup_{\|y\| < \varepsilon_n} \Big| \sum_{t \in T(k)} W_{t,k}(x, y) \Big| \leq \max_{(v,w) \in Z} \Big| \sum_{t \in T(k)} W_{t,k}(v, w) \Big| + \max_{(v,w) \in Z} \Big| \sum_{t \in T(k)} V_{t,k}(v, w) \Big|.$$

We now use blocking to show that both terms in the right hand side are of order $O_{\mathbb{P}}(\rho_n(\varepsilon_n))$, uniformly in k. Since the random variables $X_{t,T}$ are $\beta-$mixing, so are the random variables $W_{t,k}$ and $V_{t,k}$, and the $\beta-$mixing coefficients $\beta_j^{[W]}$ of $W_{t,k}$ are bounded by $\beta_{0 \vee (j-B_n)}^{[X]}$. The same holds for the $\beta-$mixing coefficients of $V_{t,k}$. Furthermore, with $\mathring{V}_{t,k} := V_{t,k} - \mathbb{E}(V_{t,k})$, it follows that

$$\begin{gathered}
\#\{W_{t,k}(v, w) | (v, w) \in Z\} = \#\{\mathring{V}_{t,k}(v, w) | (v, w) \in Z\} = O(n^4), \\
\max_{(v,w) \in Z} |W_{t,k}(v, w)| \leq n^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{(v,w) \in Z} |V_{t,k}(v, w)| = O(n^{-1}), \\
\mathbb{E}(W_{t,k}(v, w)) = \mathbb{E}(\mathring{V}_{t,k}(v, w)) = 0,
\end{gathered}$$

so that the classes $\{W_{t,k}(v,w)|(v,w) \in Z\}$ and $\{\mathring{V}_{t,k}(v,w)|(v,w) \in Z\}$ satisfy conditions $(i)-(iii)$ in lemma A.3.5 with $m_f(n) = O(n^5)$ and $M_n = 1/n$. Set

$$a_n = \lceil (n^{\frac{1}{\delta+1}} \vee k_n) \log(n) \rceil, \quad \mu_n = \lfloor \frac{n}{2a_n} \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad r_n = \rho_n(\varepsilon_n),$$

so that conditions (a) and (b) of that lemma are satisfied as well, for n large enough, by the random variables $(W_{t,k})_{t\in T(k)}$ and $(V_{t,k})_{t\in T(k)}$, for any k. A Taylor expansion yields

$$\sup_{t,k,(v,w)\in Z} |\mathbb{E}W_{t,k}(v,w)W_{s,k}(v,w)| = O(\varepsilon_n)$$

for any s,t, and

$$\sup_{t,k,(v,w)\in Z} |\mathbb{E}W_{t,k}(v,w)W_{s,k}(v,w)| = O(\varepsilon_n^2)$$

for any s,t such that $t,\ t+k,\ s$ and $s+k$ are four distinct indices. Note that, for a given k, there exist $O(a_n)$ pairs (s,t) with $t_1 \le s,t \le t_2$ such that at least two of the four indices $(t,t+k,s,s+k)$ coincide. Thus, for sufficiently large n and all $t_2 - t_1 = a_n$,

$$\sup_{k\le B_n} \sup_{(v,w)\in Z} \mathrm{Var}\Big(\sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2} W_{t,k}(x,y)\Big) \le c_1\Big(\frac{a_n}{n^2}\big(\varepsilon_n + a_n\varepsilon_n^2\big)\Big). \tag{A.20}$$

Applying Lemma A.3.5 to the triangular array $\{W_{t,k}(v,w)\}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{k\le B_n}\sup_{(v,w)\in Z}\Big|\sum_{t\in T(k)} W_{t,k}(v,w)\Big| > D\rho_n(\varepsilon_n)\Big)& \\ \le O(n^5)\exp\Big(-\frac{\log(2)}{2}\Big(\frac{D^2\rho_n(\epsilon_n)^2}{4\mu_n V_n} \wedge \frac{D\rho_n(\varepsilon_n)}{2a_n n^{-1}}\Big)\Big),&\end{aligned}$$

where $V_n := c_1(\frac{a_n}{n^2}(\varepsilon_n + a_n\varepsilon_n^2))$ and D beeing an arbitrary constant. Now, the definition of $\rho_n(\varepsilon_n)$ implies that D can be chosen in such a way that the right-hand side of the above

inequality tends to zero for $n \to \infty$, i.e. for D sufficiently large

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{k \le B_n} \sup_{(v,w) \in Z} | \sum_{t \in T(k)} W_{t,k}(v,w)| > D\rho_n(\varepsilon_n) \Big) = o(1).$$

The same case analysis as before yields

$$\sup_{k \le B_n} \sup_{(v,w) \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathrm{Var}(\sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2} \mathring{V}_{t,k}(v,w)) = O(\frac{a_n}{n^3} + \frac{a_n^2}{n^4}) = O(\frac{a_n}{n^3}),$$

for all $t_2 - t_1 = a_n$; yet another application of lemma A.3.5 entails, for a suitable constant D,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{k \le B_n} \sup_{(v,w) \in Z} | \sum_{t \in T(k)} V_{t,k}(v,w)| > D\rho_n(\epsilon_n) \Big) = o(1).$$

This completes the proof of (A.2). □

A.4.2 Proof of (A.3)

First, note that

$$\sum_{|k| \le n-1} K_n(k) e^{-i\omega k} \frac{1}{n} \Big[\sum_{t \in T(k)} \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1 \Big) \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T} \le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2 \Big) - \sum_{|t-t_0| \le m_T - B_n} \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1 \Big) \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T} \le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2 \Big) \Big] = O_P(B_n^2/n) = o_P(\sqrt{B_n/n}).$$

By simple algebra, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{|t-t_0| \le m_T - B_n} \Big[\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T} \le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - F_{t;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) \Big) \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T} \le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)) \Big)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad - \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - \tau_2\Big)\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T - B_n} \Big[\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\Big(\tau_2 - F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big) \\
&\qquad + \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2)\}} - F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big)\Big(\tau_1 - F_{t;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))\Big)\Big] =: a_{1,n} + a_{2,n}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Denoting by $A_{i,n} = \sum_{|k|\le n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}a_{i,n}$ the proof consists in showing that $\mathbb{E}|A_{i,n}|^2 = o(B_n/n)$, $i = 1, 2$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}|A_{1,n}|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{|k|\le n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T - B_n}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\Big(\tau_2 - F_{t+k;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big)\right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{|t_1-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\sum_{|t_2-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1\Big)\Big] \\
&\qquad \times \sum_{|k_1|\le n-1} K_n(k_1)e^{-i\omega k_1}\Big(\tau_2 - F_{t_1+k_1;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big) \qquad \text{(A.21)} \\
&\qquad \times \sum_{|k_2|\le n-1} K_n(k_2)e^{i\omega k_2}\Big(\tau_2 - F_{t_2+k_2;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_2))\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

in view of Lemma A.3.7 and the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1)(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}} - \tau_1)] \\
&= F_{t_1,t_2;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1), q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) - \tau_1 F_{t_2;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) - \tau_1 F_{t_1;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) + \tau_1^2 \\
&= \mathrm{cum}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}}) + F_{t_1;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1))F_{t_2;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) \\
&\qquad - \tau_1 F_{t_2;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) - \tau_1 F_{t_1;T}(q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)) + \tau_1^2 \\
&= \mathrm{cum}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}}, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2,T}\le q^{\vartheta}(\tau_1)\}}) + O(n^2/T^2),
\end{aligned}
$$

the right hand side of (A.21) is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{\substack{|t_1-t_0|\le m_T-B_n\\ |t_2-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}}\Big[\mathrm{cum}(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_1)\}},\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_1)\}})+O\Big(\Big[\frac{n}{T}\Big]^2\Big)\Big]O\Big(\Big[\frac{n}{TB_n^{d-1}}+B_n/T\Big]^2\Big)$$
$$=O\Big(n^{-1}+n^2/T^2\Big)O\Big(\Big[\frac{n}{TB_n^{d-1}}+B_n/T\Big]^2\Big)$$

Turning to $A_{2,n}$, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|A_{2,n}|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{|k|\le n-1}K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\\
&\qquad\times\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t+k,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_2)\}}-F_{t+k;T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2))\Big)\Big(\tau_1-F_{t;T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_1))\Big)\Big|^2\\
&=\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{\substack{|k_1|\le n-1\\ |k_2|\le n-1}}K_n(k_1)K_n(k_2)e^{-i\omega(k_1-k_2)}\sum_{\substack{|t_1-t_0|\le m_T-B_n\\ |t_2-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}}\Big[\Big(\tau_2-F_{t_1;T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2))\Big)\\
&\qquad\times\Big(\tau_2-F_{t_2;T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2))\Big)\mathrm{cum}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1+k_1,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_2)\}},\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2+k_2,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_1)\}}\Big)\Big]\\
&\le\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{\substack{|k_1|\le n-1\\ |k_2|\le n-1}}\sum_{\substack{|t_1-t_0|\le m_T-B_n\\ |t_2-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}}O\Big(\frac{n^2}{T^2}\Big)\Big|\mathrm{cum}\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_1+k_1,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_2)\}},\mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t_2+k_2,T}\le q^\vartheta(\tau_1)\}}\Big)\Big|\\
&\le O(1/T^2)\sum_{|t_1-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\sum_{|k_1|\le B_n}O(B_n)\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}\kappa_2(m)=O(nB_n^2/T^2)=o(B_n/n),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that, for each fixed value of t_1, k_1 and each $m\in\mathbb{Z}$ there are at most $O(B_n)$ values of k_2, t_2 such that $t_1+k_1-t_2-k_2=m$ and Assumption (A3)(iii), which implies that the sum over m is finite. □

A.4.3 Proof of (A.4)

To start with, let us state the following lemma.

Lemma A.4.1. *For any $a_n \to \infty$ such that $a_n/n = o(1), B_n/a_n = o(1)$ we have for $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \{\omega, -\omega\}$*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{|s-t_0|\le m_T} \Big| \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n} W_{t_1,T}(\omega_1) \overline{\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n} W_{t_2,T}(\omega_2)} \Big] \\
&\qquad - 2\pi \frac{a_n B_n}{n^2} \int K^2(u) du \Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{\omega_1=\omega_2\}} \mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1, \tau_1, \tau_1) \mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(-\omega_2, \tau_2, \tau_2) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \mathbb{I}_{\{\omega_1=-\omega_2\}} \mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1, \tau_1, \tau_2) \mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega_2, \tau_2, \tau_1) \Big) \Big| \\
&= o(B_n a_n / n^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n} W_{t_1,T}(\omega_1) \sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n} W_{t_2,T}(\omega_2) \Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{|k_1|\le B_n} \sum_{|k_2|\le B_n} K_n(k_1) K_n(k_2) \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(k_1\omega_1 + k_2\omega_2)} \\
&\qquad \times \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n} \sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n} \mathrm{Cov}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1} Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1} Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2} \big) \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{|k_1|\le B_n} \sum_{|k_2|\le B_n} K_n(k_1) K_n(k_2) \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(k_1\omega_1 + k_2\omega_2)} \\
&\qquad \times \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n} \sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n} \Big[\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}, Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2} \big) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1} \big) \mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2} \big) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2} \big) \mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1} \big) \Big]
\end{aligned}$$

$$=:\ C_{1,n} + D_{1,n} + D_{2,n}.$$

For $C_{1,n}$ note that

$$\begin{aligned}|C_{1,n}| &\leq \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\frac{\|K_n\|_\infty^2}{n^2}\sum_{|k_1|\leq B_n}\sum_{|k_2|\leq B_n}\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}|\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}, Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2}\big)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\frac{\|K_n\|_\infty^2}{n^2}\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{t_2,\ldots,t_4=1}^{T}|\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}, Y_{t_2,\tau_2}, Y_{t_3,\tau_1}, Y_{t_4,\tau_2}\big)| = O(a_n/n^2)\end{aligned}$$

since the inner sum is bounded by Assumption (A3)(iii) with $p = 4$, uniformly in t_1. For the second inequality, note that $(t_1, k_1, t_2, k_2) \mapsto (t_1, t_1 + k_1, t_2, t_2 + k_2)$ is injective as it has $(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) \mapsto (s_1, s_2 - s_1, s_3, s_4 - s_3)$ as an inverse. Next, define $Y_{t,\tau}^{\vartheta} := \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t^{\vartheta}\leq q^{\vartheta}(\tau)\}} - \tau$ and

$$\begin{aligned}D_{1,n}^{\vartheta} &:= \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\sum_{|k_1|\leq B_n}\sum_{|k_2|\leq B_n}K_n(k_1)K_n(k_2)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(k_1\omega_1+k_2\omega_2)} \\ &\qquad\times\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}\big), \\ D_{2,n}^{\vartheta} &:= \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\sum_{|k_1|\leq B_n}\sum_{|k_2|\leq B_n}K_n(k_1)K_n(k_2)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(k_1\omega_1+k_2\omega_2)} \\ &\qquad\times\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}\big).\end{aligned}$$

After some computation, in view of local stationarity, there exists a constant C such that, uniformly in $\tau_1, \tau_2, t_1, t_2, k_1, k_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|&\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2}\big) \\ &\qquad - \mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}, Y_{t_2,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(Y_{t_1+k_1,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}, Y_{t_2+k_2,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}\big)\Big| \leq Cn/T.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sup_{t_1,k_1}\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}\kappa_2(t_1-t_2)\sum_{|k_2|\le B_n}\kappa_2(t_1+k_1-(t_2+k_2))<\infty,$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{t_1,k_1}\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{|k_2|\le B_n}\min\Big(\frac{nC}{T},\kappa_2(t_1-t_2)\kappa_2(t_1+k_1-(t_2+k_2))\Big)=o(1).$$

This, along with assumption (A3)(iii) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&|D_{1,n}-D_{1,n}^{\vartheta}|\\
&\quad\le\frac{1}{4\pi^2n^2}\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{|k_1|\le B_n}\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}\sum_{|k_2|\le B_n}\min\Big(\frac{nC}{T},\kappa_2(t_1-t_2)\kappa_2(t_1+k_1-(t_2+k_2))\Big)\\
&\quad=o(a_nB_n/n^2).
\end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows that $|D_{2,n}-D_{2,n}^{\vartheta}|=o(a_nB_n/n^2)$. Summarizing, we have shown that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}W_{t_1,T}(\omega_1)\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}W_{t_2,T}(\omega_2)\Big]=D_{1,n}^{\vartheta}+D_{2,n}^{\vartheta}+o(a_nB_n/n^2).$$

Now arguments similar to the ones used to show that $C_{1,n}=O(a_n/n^2)$ yield

$$D_{1,n}^{\vartheta}+D_{2,n}^{\vartheta}=\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n}W_{t_1}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1)\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n}W_{t_2}^{\vartheta}(\omega_2)\Big]+o(a_nB_n/n^2)$$

where $W_t^{\vartheta}(\omega):=n^{-1}\sum_{|k|\le n-1}K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}(Y_{t,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}Y_{t+k,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}-\mathbb{E}[Y_{t,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}Y_{t+k,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}])$. Let

$$h^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2):=\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{a_n}\sum_{|k|\le n-1}K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\sum_{t\in S_k(s,a_n)}(Y_{t,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}Y_{t+k,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}-\mathbb{E}[Y_{t,\tau_1}^{\vartheta}Y_{t+k,\tau_2}^{\vartheta}]).$$

Proceeding as in Rosenblatt (1984), pp. 1173-1174, we have that

$$\mathrm{Var}\Big(\sum_{t=s}^{s+a_n} W_t^{\vartheta}(\omega) - \frac{a_n}{n} h^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)\Big) = O\Big(\frac{B_n^2}{n^2}\Big) \tag{A.22}$$

uniformly in $|s-t_0| \le m_T$ where $S_k(s,a_n) := \{t : s \le t \le s+a_n, s \le t+k \le s+a_n\}$. Now, $h^{\vartheta}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ is the usual lag-window estimator (centered by its expectation) of the cross-spectrum between $(Y_{t,\tau_1})_{s\le t\le s+a_n}$ and $(Y_{t,\tau_2})_{s\le t\le s+a_n}$. Thus, classical results from spectral density estimation yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[h^{\vartheta}(\omega_1,\tau_1,\tau_2)\overline{h^{\vartheta}(\omega_2,\tau_1,\tau_2)}] =& 2\pi\frac{B_n}{a_n}\int K^2(u)\mathrm{d}u\Big(\mathbb{I}_{\{\omega_1=\omega_2\}}\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1,\tau_1,\tau_1)\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1,\tau_2,\tau_2)\\ &+ \mathbb{I}_{\{\omega_1=-\omega_2\}}\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1,\tau_1,\tau_2)\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta}(-\omega_1,\tau_2,\tau_1)\Big) + o\Big(\frac{B_n}{a_n}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{A.23}$$

This combined with (A.22) and the fact that $W_{t,T}^{\vartheta}(\omega)$ and $h^{\vartheta}(\omega_2,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ are centered entails

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t_1=s}^{s+a_n} W_{t_1}^{\vartheta}(\omega_1)\sum_{t_2=s}^{s+a_n} W_{t_2}^{\vartheta}(\omega_2)\Big] - \frac{a_n^2}{n^2}\mathbb{E}[h^{\vartheta}(\omega_1,\tau_1,\tau_2)h^{\vartheta}(\omega_2,\tau_1,\tau_2)] = O\Big(\frac{B_n^{3/2}a_n^{1/2}+B_n^2}{n^2}\Big).$$

Since $B_n = o(a_n)$ by assumption, this with (A.23) completes the proof of Lemma A.4.1. □

Next. observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)\\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|k|\le n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}(Y_{t,\tau_1}Y_{t+k,\tau_2} - \mathbb{E}[Y_{t,\tau_1}Y_{t+k,\tau_2}])\\ &=: \sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T-B_n} W_{t,T}(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

By construction, the random variables $W := \{W_{t,T}(\omega)\}_{|t-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}$ form a triangular array

of β-mixing random variables with β-mixing coefficients

$$\beta^{[W]}(j) \leq \beta^{[X]}(0 \vee j - B_n).$$

To establish the central limit theorem, we will apply the blocking technique from section A.3.2 with different block lengths p_n, q_n. Choose p_n, q_n such that

$$q_n/p_n \to 0, \quad B_n/q_n \to 0 \text{ and } p_n/n \to 0. \tag{A.24}$$

Now decompose

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j} W_{t,T}(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\sum_{t\in\Delta_j} W_{t,T}(\omega) + \sum_{t\in R} W_{t,T}(\omega) \\ &=: S_\Gamma^n + S_\Delta^n + S_R^n, \quad \text{say.}\end{aligned}$$

By construction, S_R^n contains at most $O(p_n + q_n)$ summands. Lemma (A.4.1) thus implies that

$$\mathrm{Var}\Big(\sum_{t\in R} W_{t,T}(\omega)\Big) = O\Big(\frac{(p_n+q_n)B_n}{n^2}\Big) = o(B_n/n),$$

and therefore $S_R^n = o_P(B_n^{1/2}/n^{1/2})$. Next, observe that, by Lemma A.3.3,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(B_n^{1/2}n^{-1/2}\big|S_\Delta^n\big| \geq \varepsilon\Big) = \mathbb{P}\Big(B_n^{1/2}n^{-1/2}\big|\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\sum_{t\in\Delta_j}\xi_{t,T}(\omega)\big| \geq \varepsilon\Big) + (\mu_n - 1)\beta_{p_n}^{[W]}.$$

The second term on the right-hand side of the above expression converges to zero by the assumptions on p_n and $\beta^{[X]}$. To show that the first term also converges to zero, observe that, by construction $\mathbb{E}\xi_{t,T}(\omega) = 0$. The definition of $\xi_{t,T}(\omega)$, combined with Lemma A.4.1 and

$q_n/p_n = o(1)$ yields

$$\mathrm{Var}\Big(\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\sum_{t\in\Delta_j}\xi_{t,T}(\omega)\Big) = \frac{n}{B_n}\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\mathrm{Var}\Big(\sum_{t\in\Delta_j}W_{t,T}(\omega)\Big) = \frac{n}{B_n}O\Big(\frac{\mu_n B_n q_n}{n^2}\Big) = o(1).$$

Thus it remains to show that $\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}S_\Gamma^n$ converges in distribution. To this end, observe that, for any measurable set A, we have, by Lemma A.3.3 and the assumptions on $\beta^{[W]}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}S_\Gamma^n \in A\Big) = \mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\xi_{t,T}(\omega) \in A\Big) + o(1).$$

Thus, it suffices to establish the weak convergence of $\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n}\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\xi_{t,T}(\omega)$. To do so, consider the triangular array of independent random vectors

$$\Big(\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\big(\Re\xi_{t,T}(\omega), \Im\xi_{t,T}(\omega)\big)^T\Big)_{j=1,\ldots,\mu_n}.$$

Applying the Cramér-Wold device, let us show that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2| \neq 0$, the triangular array of independent random variables

$$\Big(\frac{n^{1/2}}{B_n^{1/2}}\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\lambda_1\Re\xi_{t,T}(\omega) + \lambda_2\Im\xi_{t,T}(\omega)\Big)_{j=1,\ldots,\mu_n}$$

satisfies the Lyapunov condition. By construction $(W_{t,T}(\omega))_{t\in\Gamma_j} \overset{d}{=} (\xi_{t,T}(\omega))_{t\in\Gamma_j}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\Re\xi_{t,T}(\omega)\Big)^4\Big] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\Re W_{t,T}(\omega)\Big)^4\Big] \\ &= 3\Big(\mathrm{Var}(\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j}\Re W_{t,T}(\omega))\Big)^2 + \sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_4\in\Gamma_j}\mathrm{cum}(\Re W_{t_1,T}(\omega),\ldots,\Re W_{t_4,T}(\omega)).\end{aligned}$$

A similar representation holds for the imaginary parts of $W_{t,T}$. Now similar arguments as those on page 1177-1178 in Rosenblatt (1984) show that

$$\sup_j \sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_4\in\Gamma_j} \Big(|\mathrm{cum}(\Re W_{t_1,T}(\omega),\ldots,\Re W_{t_4,T}(\omega))| + |\mathrm{cum}(\Im W_{t_1,T}(\omega),\ldots,\Im W_{t_4,T}(\omega))|\Big)$$
$$= O(q_n^2 B_n^2/n^4). \tag{A.25}$$

To verify this, note that exactly as in Rosenblatt (1984) the cumulant term can be expressed in terms of cumulants of the random variables $Y_{t,\tau_j}, j = 1,2, t \in \Gamma_j$ by summation over indecomposable partititions. Apply (A3)(iii) to bound those cumulants uniformly and after that follow the arguments as in Rosenblatt (1984) to bound the sums.

Hence (A.25) entails, for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j} \lambda_1 \Re\xi_{t,T}(\omega) + \lambda_2 \Im\xi_{t,T}(\omega)\Big)^4\Big] = O(\mu_n q_n^2 B_n^2/n^4)$$

and, by Lemma (A.4.1), for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2| \neq 0$

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_n} \mathrm{Var}(\sum_{t\in\Gamma_j} \lambda_1 \Re\xi_{t,T}(\omega) + \lambda_2 \Im\xi_{t,T}(\omega))\Big)^2 \geq c_0(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)\mu_n^2 q_n^2 B_n^2/n^4$$

for some $c_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) > 0$ for sufficiently large n. Thus the conditions of Lyapunovs central limit theorem are satisfied as $\mu_n \to \infty$. This completes the proof of (A.4). □

A.4.4 Proof of (A.5)

The proof of (A.5) relies on the following lemma (see Priestley (1981), page 459 for similar arguments).

Lemma A.4.2. *Uniformly in $|u-\vartheta| \leq n/T$ and $x,\ y$ in a neighborhood of τ_1, τ_2 we have*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{|k|\leq n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\gamma_k^u(x,y) = \mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y) - C_K(r)B_n^{-r}\mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)}\mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y) + o(B_n^{-r}).$$

Proof Choose some $L_n \to \infty$ such that $L_n/B_n \to 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{|k|\leq n-1} K_n(k)e^{-i\omega k}\gamma_k^u(x,y) - \mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y) \\
&\qquad = B_n^{-r}\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{|k|\leq L_n}\frac{K(k/B_n)-1}{|k/B_n|^r}|k|^r e^{-i\omega k}\gamma_k^u(x,y) \\
&\qquad\quad + B_n^{-r}\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{B_n\geq|k|>L_n}\frac{K(k/B_n)-1}{|k/B_n|^r}|k|^r e^{-i\omega k}\gamma_k^u(x,y) \\
&\qquad\quad - B_n^{-r}\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{|k|>B_n} e^{-i\omega k}\frac{B_n^r}{|k|^r}|k|^r\gamma_k^u(x,y).
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption (K) and (A3)(ii) $\sup_v \frac{|K(v)-1|}{|v|^r}$ and $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}|k|^r|\gamma_k^u(x,y)|$ are bounded. Therefore, the last term in the above expression is

$$O(B_n^{-r})\sum_{|k|>B_n}|k|^r|\gamma_k^u(x,y)| = o(B_n^{-r}),$$

and the second term is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|B_n^{-r}\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{B_n\geq|k|>L_n}\frac{K(k/B_n)-1}{|k/B_n|^r}|k|^r e^{-i\omega k}\gamma_k^u(x,y)\right| \\
&\qquad\qquad \leq O(B_n^{-r})\sup_v\frac{|K(v)-1|}{|v|^r}\sum_{B_n\geq|k|>L_n}|k|^r|\gamma_k^u(x,y)| = o(B_n^{-r}),
\end{aligned}$$

since $L_n \to \infty$. Finally, for the first term observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2\pi} B_n^{-r} \sum_{|k|\le L_n} \frac{K(k/B_n)-1}{|k/B_n|^r} |k|^r e^{-i\omega k} \gamma_k^u(x,y) + C_K(r) B_n^{-r} \mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)} \mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y) \qquad \text{(A.26)}\\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2\pi} B_n^{-r} \sum_{|k|\le L_n} \Big(\frac{K(k/B_n)-1}{|k/B_n|^r} + C_K(r) \Big) |k|^r e^{-i\omega k} \gamma_k^u(x,y)\\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{2\pi} C_K(r) B_n^{-r} \sum_{|k|> L_n} |k|^r e^{-i\omega k} \gamma_k^u(x,y).
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand side of (A.26) is of order $o(B_n^{-r})$ since, by Assumption (K), $L_n/B_n \to 0$ implies $\frac{K(k/B_n)-1}{|k/B_n|^r} \to -C_K(r)$ and $|k|^r|\gamma_k^u(x,y)|$ is absolutely summable, while the second term is $o(B_n^{-r})$ since $L_n \to \infty$ and $|k|^r|\gamma_k^u(x,y)|$ is absolutely summable. Note that under the assumptions made all arguments hold uniformly in u, x, y. This completes the proof. □

We can now prove (A.5). First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{n} &\sum_{|k|\le n-1} K_n(k) e^{-i\omega k}\\
&\times \sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T - B_n} \gamma_k^{t/T}(G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)), G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2))) + O(B_n/T).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, observe that by A.4.2 and the continuity of $(u,x,y) \mapsto \mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)} \mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,x,y)$,

$$\sup_{|t-t_0|\le m_T - B_n} \Big| \mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)} \mathfrak{f}^{t/T}(\omega, G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)), G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2))) - \mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)} \mathfrak{f}^\vartheta(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) \Big| = o(1)$$

since $G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau)) \to \tau$ for $u \to \vartheta$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}_{t_0,T}(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2) = -\, C_K(r) B_n^{-r} \mathfrak{d}_\omega^{(r)} \mathfrak{f}^\vartheta(\omega,\tau_1,\tau_2)$$

$$+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\mathfrak{f}^{t/T}(\omega,G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)))+o(B_n^{-r}).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{|t-t_0|\le m_T-B_n}\mathfrak{f}^{t/T}(\omega,G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^{t/T}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)))\\
&=\frac{T}{2m_T}\int_{-m_T/T}^{m_T/T}\mathfrak{f}^{\vartheta+u}(\omega,G^{\vartheta+u}(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^{\vartheta+u}(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)))+O(1/n)\\
&=\mathfrak{f}^\vartheta(\omega,q^\vartheta(\tau_1),q^\vartheta(\tau_2))\\
&\qquad+\frac{n^2}{2T^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}\mathfrak{f}^u(\omega,G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_1)),G^u(q^\vartheta(\tau_2)))\Big|_{u=\vartheta}+O(1/n)+o(n^2/T^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Statement (A.5) follows. □